The University of Chicago
Libraries



DURRETT COLLECTION

THE

BELIEVER'S DEFENCE,

OR, THE DOCTRINE OF

THE TRINITY OF GOD

AND ATONEMENT OF CHRIST

DEFENDED AGAINST UNITARIANISM.

COMPILED FROM VARIOUS AUTHORS.

BY ALBERT McWRIGHT,
Minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

"There are three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one."—I JOHN v. 7.

COLUMBUS, OHIO.
PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHOR.
C. Scott, Printer.
1841.

BX 9847
M2
THE LIBRARY OF CHICAGO

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1841,
By Albert McWright,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Ohio.

473617

INTRODUCTION.

The compiler of the following pages probably would never have stepped out of his beloved obscurity for the purpose of defending one of the most important doctrines in Christian theology, had not a train of circumstances compelled him to enter the field of controversy, or abandon what he deemed to be fundamental truth in our holy religion, to the reckless assaults of its enemies, who, having grown bold through neglect, challenged him to public combat under circumstances which left him but one alternative, either to give up the truth as indefensible, or "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." Under these circumstances, the design of publishing the present work was conceived.

The compiler makes no pretensions to originality. Various authors have been consulted, and in most cases the language of other writers has been adopted. Alterations having been made only when it was thought such alterations would increase the force or clearness of the argument.

The authors that have been consulted are Wesley, Fletcher, Clark, Abbadie, Drew, Hare, Luckey, Lee, and various others. The most copious extracts, however, have been made from the writings of the Rev. Richard Watson, whose works are worthy the attention of all who are seeking after the truth as it is in Jesus.

It is well known that Unitarians, in consequence of the diversity of opinions existing among them on subjects of minor importance, are divided into various sects, among whom are to be found a class of people calling themselves Christians, but commonly known by the name of New-Lights. Against these the following work is more particularly directed, but not to the exclusion of the rest, the author having endeavored so to manage the argument that all classes of Unitarians are opposed by the same proofs.

Some may suppose that enough has been written on this subject, and that there is no call for a work of this description at the present time. This has been considered by the author, and after a due examination of the principal works on this important subject, he has come to the conclusion to add one more to the number, for which he offers the following reasons:

1. "The works which have already been published have not yet fully put a stop to the errors against which they have been directed, nor do they appear likely to accomplish this object, very seasonably, without additional aid. While others have commenced the assault and battered down some of the bulwarks of error, the writer of these pages wishes to add his humble efforts, hoping that others will follow his example, until her strongest holds shall be demolished, and the heresy shall be known only in the history of the past."

2. Unitarianism "has so shifted its ground and changed its complexion, that many of the works which, at the time they were written, were directed against it with a deadly aim, are now left to spend their strength in the air, the enemy having [illegible] and erected his battery on other ground, from whence he [illegible] his incendiary warfare, and talks as much of courage and victory as though he had never been defeated."

3. Most of the works which have been published on the subject, are too voluminous to admit of a general circulation, or to be read by a large portion of the public. The compiler of this work has, therefore, looked upon it as an object of no small importance, to put into the hands of the public, in one convenient volume, a refutation of Unitarianism in all the various forms which it assumes, as it is driven from one position to another.

In conclusion, whatever may be the fate assigned to these pages by the impartial judgment of the public, the compiler can appeal to his DIVINE REDEEMER, the adorable Immanuel, to whom he now dedicates this work, for the rectitude of his motives; to whom, also, he directs his most fervent prayers, that both writer and reader may be guided into all truth.

BLOOMFIELD, August 1, 1841.

BELIEVER'S DEFENCE.

CHAPTER I.

ON THE IMPROPRIETY OF MAKING HUMAN REASON THE TEST OF THE DOCTRINES OF DIVINE REVELATION.

It is one of the disadvantages to be encountered in this work, that while the evangelical party take only the Scriptures for their guide, Unitarians claim it as a privilege to appeal from the sacred writers to the dictates of unassisted reason. The latter will submit their opinions to the test of Scripture, only when the Scriptures will stand the ordeal of their opinions. Or, to speak with greater propriety, they choose to try rather the Scriptures by their creed, than their creed by the Scriptures. When the language of the evangelists and apostles appears to favor their hypothesis, they are prepared to make the utmost use of its authority; but when the contrary is the case, and the plainest declarations of the sacred writers cannot be transformed into metaphor, allegory, or figurative representation; when the primitive teachers of Christianity obstinately refuse to become Unitarians, or even to be neutral, our opponents are prepared to pronounce against them a sentence of excommunication, and to erase their testimony from the record, as an interpolation, a corruption of the sacred text, or an inconclusive argument.

That this is the course pursued by Unitarians, the following extracts from some of their principal writers, will abundantly show:

Socinius, the founder of Socinianism, while speaking on the doctrine of Atonement, says:—"Though it were found not only once, but frequently, written in the Holy

Some may suppose that enough has been written on this subject, and that there is no call for a work of this description at the present time. This has been considered by the author, and after a due examination of the principal works on this important subject, he has come to the conclusion to add one more to the number, for which he offers the following reasons:

1. "The works which have already been published have not yet fully put a stop to the errors against which they have been directed, nor do they appear likely to accomplish this object, very seasonably, without additional aid. While others have commenced the assault and battered down some of the bulwarks of error, the writer of these pages wishes to add his humble efforts, hoping that others will follow his example, until her strongest holds shall be demolished, and the heresy shall be known only in the history of the past."

2. Unitarianism "has so shifted its ground and changed its complexion, that many of the works which, at the time they were written, were directed against it with a deadly aim, are now left to spend their strength in the air, the enemy having [illegible] and erected his battery on other ground, from whence he [illegible] his incendiary warfare, and talks as much of courage and victory as though he had never been defeated."

3. Most of the works which have been published on the subject, are too voluminous to admit of a general circulation, or to be read by a large portion of the public. The compiler of this work has, therefore, looked upon it as an object of no small importance, to put into the hands of the public, in one convenient volume, a refutation of Unitarianism in all the various forms which it assumes, as it is driven from one position to another.

In conclusion, whatever may be the fate assigned to these pages by the impartial judgment of the public, the compiler can appeal to his DIVINE REDEEMER, the adorable Immanuel, to whom he now dedicates this work, for the rectitude of his motives; to whom, also, he directs his most fervent prayers, that both writer and reader may be guided into all truth.

BLOOMFIELD, August 1, 1841.

BELIEVER'S DEFENCE.

CHAPTER I.

ON THE IMPROPRIETY OF MAKING HUMAN REASON THE TEST OF THE DOCTRINES OF DIVINE REVELATION.

It is one of the disadvantages to be encountered in this work, that while the evangelical party take only the Scriptures for their guide, Unitarians claim it as a privilege to appeal from the sacred writers to the dictates of unassisted reason. The latter will submit their opinions to the test of Scripture only when the Scriptures will stand the ordeal of their opinions. Or, to speak with greater propriety, they choose to try rather the Scriptures by their creed, than their creed by the Scriptures. When the language of the evangelists and apostles appears to favor their hypothesis, they are prepared to make the utmost use of its authority; but when the contrary is the case, and the plainest declarations of the sacred writers cannot be transformed into metaphor, allegory, or figurative representation; when the primitive teachers of Christianity obstinately refuse to become Unitarians, or even to be neutral, our opponents are prepared to pronounce against them a sentence of excommunication, and to erase their testimony from the record, as an interpolation, a corruption of the sacred text, or an inconclusive argument.

That this is the course pursued by Unitarians, the following extracts from some of their principal writers, will abundantly show:

Socinins, the founder of Socinianism, while speaking on the doctrine of Atonement, says:—"Though it were found not only once, but frequently, written in the Holy

Scriptures, I indeed would not believe it to be entirely as you suppose. Though the divine oracles may attest things to be so in appearance, yet they cannot by any means be admitted, because they are very evidently impossible."

Smalcius, another Unitarian, says:—"We believe that though we should find it not once, nor twice, but very frequently, and most expressly written in the Scriptures, that God was made man, it would be much better, as it is an absurd proposition, entirely contrary to sound reason and full of blasphemy, to invent some other way of speaking which might render it safe to be affirmed of God, rather than understand it in the literal sense."

Dr. Priestly, a very celebrated Unitarian, says, in the Theological Repository:—"I think I have shown that the Apostle Paul often reasons inconclusively, and therefore that he wrote as any other person of his turn of mind or thinking, and in his situation, would have written without any particular inspiration."

Mr. Belsham, of the same school, says:—"That Jesus of Nazareth was a man constituted in all respects like other men, subject to the same infirmities, the same ignorance, prejudices and frailties."

Mr. Theodore Parke, in an Ordination Sermon, recently preached in Boston, after speaking of what he calls the difficulties of the Bible, says:—

"Hence the attempt which always fails, to reconcile the philosophy of our times with the poems in Genesis, written a thousand years before Christ; hence the attempt to conceal the contradictions in the record itself. Matters have come to such a pass that even now, he is deemed an infidel, if not by implication an atheist, whose reverence for the Most High forbids him to believe that God commanded Abraham to sacrifice his son, a thought at which the flesh creeps with horror; to believe it solely on the authority of an oriental story, written down nobody knows when, or by whom, or for what purpose: which may be a poem, but cannot be

the record of a fact unless God is the author of confusion and a lie."—pp. 20, 21.

"On the authority of the written word, man was taught to believe fiction for fact; a dream for a miraculous revelation of God; an oriental poem for a grave history of miraculous events; a collection of amatory idyls for a serious discourse 'touching the mutual love of Christ and the Church; they have been taught to accept a picture sketched by some glowing eastern imagination, never intended to be taken for a reality, as a proof that the infinite God spoke in human words; appeared in the shape of a cloud, a flaming bush, or a man who ate and drank and vanished into smoke; that he gave counsels to-day, and the opposite to-morrow; that he violated his own laws, was angry, and was only dissuaded by a mortal man from destroying at once a whole nation—millions of men who rebelled against their leader in a moment of anguish."—pp. 19, 20.

"The history of opinions on the New Testament is quite similar. It has been assumed at the outset, it would seem, with no sufficient reason, without the smallest pretence on its writers' parts, that all of its authors were infallibly and miraculously inspired, so that they could commit no error of doctrine or fact. Men have been bid to close their eyes at the obvious difference between Luke and John; the serious disagreement between Paul and Peter; to believe on the smallest evidence, accounts which shock the moral sense and revolt the reason, and tend to place Jesus in the same series with Hercules and Apollonius of Tyana, accounts which Paul in the Epistles never mentions, though he also had a vein of the miraculous running quite through him."—p. 22.

"Who shall assure us that they [the writers of the New Testament] were not sometimes mistaken in historical, as well as doctrinal matters, did not sometimes confound the actual with the imaginary, and that the fan-

Scriptures, I indeed would not believe it to be entirely as you suppose. Though the divine oracles may attest things to be so in appearance, yet they cannot by any means be admitted, because they are very evidently impossible."

Smalcius, another Unitarian, says:—"We believe that though we should find it not once, nor twice, but very frequently, and most expressly written in the Scriptures, that God was made man, it would be much better, as it is an absurd proposition, entirely contrary to sound reason and full of blasphemy, to invent some other way of speaking which might render it safe to be affirmed of God, rather than understand it in the literal sense."

Dr. Priestly, a very celebrated Unitarian, says, in the Theological Repository:—"I think I have shown that the Apostle Paul often reasons inconclusively, and therefore that he wrote as any other person of his turn of mind or thinking, and in his situation, would have written without any particular inspiration."

Mr. Belsham, of the same school, says:—"That Jesus of Nazareth was a man constituted in all respects like other men, subject to the same infirmities, the same ignorance, prejudices and frailties."

Mr. Theodore Parke, in an Ordination Sermon, recently preached in Boston, after speaking of what he calls the difficulties of the Bible, says:—

"Hence the attempt which always fails, to reconcile the philosophy of our times with the poems in Genesis, written a thousand years before Christ; hence the attempt to conceal the contradictions in the record itself. Matters have come to such a pass that even now, he is deemed an infidel, if not by implication an atheist, whose reverence for the Most High forbids him to believe that God commanded Abraham to sacrifice his son, a thought at which the flesh creeps with horror; to believe it solely on the authority of an oriental story, written down nobody knows when, or by whom, or for what purpose: which may be a poem, but cannot be

the record of a fact unless God is the author of confusion and a lie."—pp. 20, 21.

"On the authority of the written word, man was taught to believe fiction for fact; a dream for a miraculous revelation of God; an oriental poem for a grave history of miraculous events; a collection of amatory idyls for a serious discourse 'touching the mutual love of Christ and the Church; they have been taught to accept a picture sketched by some glowing eastern imagination, never intended to be taken for a reality, as a proof that the infinite God spoke in human words; appeared in the shape of a cloud, a flaming bush, or a man who ate and drank and vanished into smoke; that he gave counsels to-day, and the opposite to-morrow; that he violated his own laws, was angry, and was only dissuaded by a mortal man from destroying at once a whole nation—millions of men who rebelled against their leader in a moment of anguish."—pp. 19, 20.

"The history of opinions on the New Testament is quite similar. It has been assumed at the outset, it would seem, with no sufficient reason, without the smallest pretence on its writers' parts, that all of its authors were infallibly and miraculously inspired, so that they could commit no error of doctrine or fact. Men have been bid to close their eyes at the obvious difference between Luke and John; the serious disagreement between Paul and Peter; to believe on the smallest evidence, accounts which shock the moral sense and revolt the reason, and tend to place Jesus in the same series with Hercules and Apollonius of Tyana, accounts which Paul in the Epistles never mentions, though he also had a vein of the miraculous running quite through him."—p. 22.

"Who shall assure us that they [the writers of the New Testament] were not sometimes mistaken in historical, as well as doctrinal matters, did not sometimes confound the actual with the imaginary, and that the fan-

cy of these pious writers never stood in the place of their recollection."—pp. 27, 28.

"No doubt the time will come when its true character will be felt. Then it will be seen, that, amid all the contradictions of the Old Testament; its legends so beautiful as fictions, so appalling as facts; amid its predictions that have never been fulfilled; amid the puerile conceptions of God which sometimes occur, and the cruel denunciations that disfigure both Psalm and Prophecy, there is a reverence for man's nature, a sublime trust in God, and a depth of piety rarely felt in these cold northern hearts of ours."—p. 30.

It may be pleaded in favor of Unitarianism that the opinions of Mr. Parker are not generally held by its adherents. This we hope is really the case; but what are we to make of the following notice of Mr. Parker, which recently appeared in the Unitarian Christian Register, the great organ of the Unitarians in Boston:

"We doubt not that the author is *eminently a Christian in life;* and we have not said, *nor dare we say,* that he is otherwise than a CHRISTIAN IN BELIEF."

Mr. Grundy, another late author, says:—"To what end was reason given? Precisely, that it may be the rule of life; the helm by which we must steer our course across the tempestuous billows of mortality; the touchstone of every doctrine; the supreme umpire in every difficulty and doubt."

Mr. Millard, of that class of Unitarians who claim to be called Christians, talks of bringing the doctrine of the Trinity to the *test* of reason, (see his work called the True Messiah, p. 23,) while it is well known that all classes of Unitarians call in question the translation of every passage of Scripture that stands opposed to their views.

These quotations clearly show that Unitarians do appeal from Revelation to the dictates of human reason in matters of religion; yea, that they receive reason as the "test" and "touchstone of every doctrine" as "the rule

of life" and "the helm by which we are to steer our course across the tempestuous billows of mortality." They say that it is "the supreme umpire in every difficulty and doubt;" and not content with thus exalting reason above Revelation, they proceed to tell us that the Scriptures contain "puerile conceptions of God;" that "cruel denunciations disfigure both Psalm and Prophecy;" that contradictions are to be found between different parts of both the Old and New Testaments; that Paul reasoned inconclusively and was not inspired; that the Saviour was ignorant and prejudiced as other men; and finally, boldly affirm that if the Bible contains any thing contrary to their reason, they will not believe it, but invent some other way of speaking.

What is this but saying we are determined to regulate, not our theological sentiments by the Scriptures, but the Scriptures by our pre-conceived opinions? As we believe that this course of our opponents, in thus placing reason above Revelation, is calculated to sow the seeds of infidelity in the minds of the unwary, we shall, for the following reasons, here enter our solemn protest against it:

1. Human reason has been corrupted by sin. Were it not for this, we might have placed a great degree of dependence upon it; yet even then it would not have been rational, to rely more on the powers of our own understanding, than on the light of Divine Revelation, supposing such a Revelation to have been enjoyed: because the knowledge of man, when his reason was unimpaired, was limited; but the knowledge of God is infinite. What a disparity, then, must there be, when the human understanding is not only limited, but *corrupted;* when the unavoidable commerce between a man's thoughts and his depraved passions, fills his mind with a multitude of prejudices, which have a tendency in various ways to disguise, or conceal, the truth!—Were we bound to believe nothing but what appears conformable to reason, in its present state, we might soon reject the great objects

revealed in the gospel, in general. For, after all the strenuous efforts of our adversaries, to remove the grand difficulties attending the Christian religion; there are, and there always will be, such depths in it, as are unfathomable by the plummet of human reason. On this account, the apostle of the Gentiles calls the gospel *foolishness*. If the doctrines of Christianity had nothing mysterious and inexplicable in them, there would be no difficulty in believing; nor would faith be any more the gift of God, than the persuasion we have of natural truths. Consequently, there would be no more occasion for the agency of the Holy Spirit, in order to our believing the truths of the gospel, than there is to our understanding the problems of geometry.

2. "To act on this principle of our opposers is to treat God, as if he were less worthy of credit than an honest man. A fallible mortal, who has not forfeited his character, as a person of veracity, would take it deservedly ill, if, when speaking of an extraordinary fact, of which he was an eye-witness, he was to say, 'Take my word for it; it is as I assert:' and we should reply, 'We must consider what you say. If we find it agreeable to our reason, we will believe you; if not, we shall entirely reject your testimony.' If, then, such language would be reckoned indecent towards a fellow-worm, what must we think of a similar conduct, in regard to God, who is equally incapable of deceiving us, as he is of being deceived?

3. "If reason were to be the rule of our faith, Revelation would be superseded. For, to what purpose should God make known the counsel of his will, if reason were allowed to say: 'This is not the counsel of God. It cannot be, for I do not comprehend it?' Thus the conscience would be influenced, not by Revelation, but by the doubt which reason had raised upon it.—Besides, if it were lawful for human reason to sit in judgment on Divine Revelation, the darkness introduced on our minds, by sin, could never be dissipated. For how

should reason, proud of her own pretended abilities, and resolved to correct Revelation itself, be enlightened? According to this arrogant and self-sufficient notion, faith in the Divine testimony is entirely set aside; reason being resolved on following her own light, in preference to that of God in the Scriptures. So that, instead of saying, I believe such a proposition, how incredible soever it may seem, because God has revealed it; we must say, Though God has revealed it in the most plain and express terms, we will not believe it, because it appears incredible to us.

4. "Were we thus to exalt reason, what is usually called Divine faith, would be much inferior to that which is human; because we should not pay so great a regard to the declarations of GOD, as to those of our parents, masters and tutors; on whose bare authority we receive a great number of truths, relating to the affairs of common life. But, in such a case, where is humility, where is that filial, teachable spirit, which is one of the marks of our adoption and regeneration? What need of submitting to the dictates of Inspiration, because it is the Eternal Sovereign who speaks; when we have nothing to do but convince ourselves of all necessary truths, by their own internal characters; and to reject, or embrace them, in exact proportion as they agree or disagree with the light of our own understanding?

"'Reason, our opponents will say, *reason* is the foundation of faith: consequently, faith cannot be more certain than reason.'—Reason, I confess, leads to Revelation: because we are taught by it, that God is infallibly wise, and that *we* are liable to err; that we cannot, therefore, do better than regard the light of Revelation, in preference to the uncertain conjectures of our own minds. But then, as reason leads us to this infallible rule, which was given by uncontrollable authority; she requires us to receive, with submission, whatever the Great Revealer asserts, as a fact; commands, as a duty; or proposes, as an object of faith."—*Abbadie.*

5. "However unwilling modern philosophers, who have received all their true wisdom from the Bible, may be to confess the insufficiency of human reason in things Divine, the sages of antiquity were honest enough to acknowledge the uncertainty of its researches.

"Pythagoras changed the name of wise men into lovers of wisdom, as believing it not to be attained by human means. Socrates often repeated, 'that he knew but one thing with certainty, and that was his ignorance of all things.' Plato frequently reminds his pupils, that in religious subjects they were not to expect proof, but only probability from them. Aristotle condemns his predecessors as the most foolish and vain-glorious persons in the world, from a conviction of their ignorance, and the vanity of imagining that he had carried philosophy to the utmost perfection it was capable of; though no one said or believed less of Divine things than he did. Tully complains, that we are blind in the discernment of wisdom; that some unaccountable error, and miserable ignorance of the truth, has got possession of us. The Stoics pretended to know all things; yet Plutarch says, 'that there neither had been, nor was a wise man on the face of the earth.' Lactantius observes, 'They could not exceed the powers of nature, nor speak truth on these (sacred) subjects, having never learned it of him who alone could instruct them; nor ever came so near it, as when they confessed their ignorance of it.' Epictetus found so much uncertainty in Divine things, that like many other heathen philosophers, he advised every one to follow the custom of his country. *(Dr. Ellis on the Knowledge of Divine Things.)*

"Socrates told Alcibiades, 'It is necessary you should wait for some person to teach you how you ought to behave yourself toward both the gods and men. He (says he) will do it who takes a true care of you. But methinks, as we read in Homer, that as Minerva dissipated the mist that covered Diomedes, and hindered him from distinguishing God and man; so it is necessary

that he should in the first place scatter the darkness that covers your soul, and afterward give you those remedies that are necessary to put you in a condition of discerning good and evil; for at present you know not how to make a difference.' *(Stanley's Lives.)* 'Plato wished for a prophet to reveal the will of God to us, without which we cannot know it.' And Plutarch says the same, 'that the knowledge of the gods can be had only from them.' Thus did they plainly attribute whatever they knew of the gods, or of divine things, to no principle but the gods.

"When Hiero, tyrant of Syracuse, asked the philosopher Simonides, that important question, What is God? the prudent philosopher required a day to consider it, and doubled his request whenever he was called upon to give in his answer. When Hiero was weary of procrastination, and inquired the reason of his delay:—'Because,' said the philosopher, 'the longer I consider the subject, the more I am at a loss for a reply.'

"Such were the modesty and diffidence of Simonides! One who was much more justly reputed for wisdom, exclaimed, 'O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!' Rom. xi, 33. 'Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty to perfection? It is as high as heaven: what canst thou do? deeper than hell, what canst thou know? The measure thereof is longer than the earth, and broader than the sea. But vain man would be wise, though man be born like a wild ass's colt.' Job xi, 7, 9, 12. The labor, however, has always been useless: 'the world by wisdom knew not God.' 1 Cor. i, 21. Among those who have not seen the dawn of Divine revelation, 'there is none that understandeth, that seeketh after God.' Rom. iii, 11. "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of a man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.' 1 Cor. ii, 11.

"The Christian Church was scarcely formed when in different places there started up certain pretended reformers, who, not satisfied with the simplicity of that religion which was taught by the apostles, set up a new religion drawn from their own licentious imaginations. Several of these are mentioned by the apostles, such as Hymenæus and Alexander. The influence of these new teachers was but inconsiderable at first. During the lives of the apostles their attempts toward the perversion of Christianity were attended with little success. They however acquired credit and strength by degrees; and even from the first dawn of the Gospel laid imperceptibly the foundation of those sects which produced afterward such trouble in the Christian Church.

"'Among the various sects that troubled the Christian Church, the leading one was that of the Gnostics. These self-sufficient philosophers boasted of their being able to restore mankind to the knowledge (gnosis) of the supreme Being, which had been lost in the world. Under the general appellation of Gnostics are comprehended all those who, in the first ages of Christianity, corrupted the doctrine of the Gospel by a profane mixture of the tenets of the oriental philosophy, with its Divine truths.' (*Mosheim*, book i, part ii, chap. v.) From these 'knowing ones' arose, in the first and second century, a rich harvest of heretics and heresies, of which, not to mention them in detail, the reader may find an ample account in the first volume of Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History. A few specimens would show that the apostles acted wisely when they cautioned their disciples against every thing destructive to the simplicity of the Gospel, and that they were not mistaken in the results of this unnatural coalition of philosophy and revelation, which they predicted. 'There is no observation capable of fuller proof, than that religion, through all ages of the Christian Church, was more or less pure according to the alloy of philosophy or human reason mixed up with it. There was scarcely a heresy in the primi-

tive Church that was not imbibed from Plato's academy, Zeno's portico, or some vain reasonings of the pagan wise men. In latter ages the schoolmen rejected Plato, and exalted Aristotle into the chair of Christ, says Tilenus, (*Til. Syntagm.*, part ii, disp. 16, thes. 31,) esteeming him the god of wisdom who could not err. And the controversy long subsisted to which of them an appeal lay for the determination of truth. Such is the vain arrogance of human reason, as to have puffed up some in every age to promise they would show us the truth by the mere light of it, and maintain it as the only rule of faith. 'Philosophy and vain deceit' have always proved highly injurious to the purity of religion, and the great objects of faith which are supernaturally revealed.' (*Dr. Ellis.*)

"Since philosophy has fallen into the hands of sincere and devout Christians, who valued above all learning "the faith delivered to the saints," and "contended" for that faith as the truest wisdom, it has been much reformed. But so long as it is human wisdom, it will never be fit to take the lead of revelation. Modern philosophers, as well as those of antiquity, whenever they attempt to model their creed by the rule of their reason, show themselves capable of the greatest absurdities. With our Unitarian divines, (as they are pleased exclusively to denominate themselves,) it is a first principle that "reason directs to whatever is true in speculation." To set reason free from the fetters of education, they have renounced the doctrine of human depravity, and of eternal punishment. Thus inspired with unlimited confidence in their own understanding, and divested of all apprehension of eternal consequences, they are 'induced to reason cautiously and frequently, and learn to reason well.' So says one of themselves.* And what can be more reasonably expected from them than that they should all reason alike?

* Mr. James Yates, in a sermon on the grounds of Unitarian dissent, preached at Glasgow, pp. 16, 17, 22, 23.

5. "However unwilling modern philosophers, who have received all their true wisdom from the Bible, may be to confess the insufficiency of human reason in things Divine, the sages of antiquity were honest enough to acknowledge the uncertainty of its researches.

"Pythagoras changed the name of wise men into lovers of wisdom, as believing it not to be attained by human means. Socrates often repeated, 'that he knew but one thing with certainty, and that was his ignorance of all things.' Plato frequently reminds his pupils, that in religious subjects they were not to expect proof, but only probability from them. Aristotle condemns his predecessors as the most foolish and vain-glorious persons in the world, from a conviction of their ignorance, and the vanity of imagining that he had carried philosophy to the utmost perfection it was capable of; though no one said or believed less of Divine things than he did. Tully complains, that we are blind in the discernment of wisdom; that some unaccountable error, and miserable ignorance of the truth, has got possession of us. The Stoics pretended to know all things; yet Plutarch says, 'that there neither had been, nor was a wise man on the face of the earth.' Lactantius observes, 'They could not exceed the powers of nature, nor speak truth on these (sacred) subjects, having never learned it of him who alone could instruct them; nor ever came so near it, as when they confessed their ignorance of it.' Epictetus found so much uncertainty in Divine things, that like many other heathen philosophers, he advised every one to follow the custom of his country. *(Dr. Ellis on the Knowledge of Divine Things.)*

"Socrates told Alcibiades, 'It is necessary you should wait for some person to teach you how you ought to behave yourself toward both the gods and men. He (says he) will do it who takes a true care of you. But methinks, as we read in Homer, that as Minerva dissipated the mist that covered Diomedes, and hindered him from distinguishing God and man; so it is necessary

that he should in the first place scatter the darkness that covers your soul, and afterward give you those remedies that are necessary to put you in a condition of discerning good and evil; for at present you know not how to make a difference.' *(Stanley's Lives.)* 'Plato wished for a prophet to reveal the will of God to us, without which we cannot know it.' And Plutarch says the same, 'that the knowledge of the gods can be had only from them.' Thus did they plainly attribute whatever they knew of the gods, or of divine things, to no principle but the gods.

"When Hiero, tyrant of Syracuse, asked the philosopher Simonides, that important question, What is God? the prudent philosopher required a day to consider it, and doubled his request whenever he was called upon to give in his answer. When Hiero was weary of procrastination, and inquired the reason of his delay:—'Because,' said the philosopher, 'the longer I consider the subject, the more I am at a loss for a reply.'

"Such were the modesty and diffidence of Simonides! One who was much more justly reputed for wisdom, exclaimed, 'O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!' Rom. xi, 33. 'Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty to perfection? It is as high as heaven: what canst thou do? deeper than hell, what canst thou know? The measure thereof is longer than the earth, and broader than the sea. But vain man would be wise, though man be born like a wild ass's colt.' Job xi, 7, 9, 12. The labor, however, has always been useless: 'the world by wisdom knew not God.' 1 Cor. i, 21. Among those who have not seen the dawn of Divine revelation, 'there is none that understandeth, that seeketh after God.' Rom. iii, 11. "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of a man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.' 1 Cor. ii, 11.

"The Christian Church was scarcely formed when in different places there started up certain pretended reformers, who, not satisfied with the simplicity of that religion which was taught by the apostles, set up a new religion drawn from their own licentious imaginations. Several of these are mentioned by the apostles, such as Hymenæus and Alexander. The influence of these new teachers was but inconsiderable at first. During the lives of the apostles their attempts toward the perversion of Christianity were attended with little success. They however acquired credit and strength by degrees; and even from the first dawn of the Gospel laid imperceptibly the foundation of those sects which produced afterward such trouble in the Christian Church.

"'Among the various sects that troubled the Christian Church, the leading one was that of the Gnostics. These self-sufficient philosophers boasted of their being able to restore mankind to the knowledge (gnosis) of the supreme Being, which had been lost in the world. Under the general appellation of Gnostics are comprehended all those who, in the first ages of Christianity, corrupted the doctrine of the Gospel by a profane mixture of the tenets of the oriental philosophy, with its Divine truths.' (*Mosheim*, book i, part ii, chap. v.) From these 'knowing ones' arose, in the first and second century, a rich harvest of heretics and heresies, of which, not to mention them in detail, the reader may find an ample account in the first volume of Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History. A few specimens would show that the apostles acted wisely when they cautioned their disciples against every thing destructive to the simplicity of the Gospel, and that they were not mistaken in the results of this unnatural coalition of philosophy and revelation, which they predicted. 'There is no observation capable of fuller proof, than that religion, through all ages of the Christian Church, was more or less pure according to the alloy of philosophy or human reason mixed up with it. There was scarcely a heresy in the primi-

tive Church that was not imbibed from Plato's academy, Zeno's portico, or some vain reasonings of the pagan wise men. In latter ages the schoolmen rejected Plato, and exalted Aristotle into the chair of Christ, says Tilenus, (*Til. Syntagm.*, part ii, disp. 16, thes. 31,) esteeming him the god of wisdom who could not err. And the controversy long subsisted to which of them an appeal lay for the determination of truth. Such is the vain arrogance of human reason, as to have puffed up some in every age to promise they would show us the truth by the mere light of it, and maintain it as the only rule of faith. 'Philosophy and vain deceit' have always proved highly injurious to the purity of religion, and the great objects of faith which are supernaturally revealed.' (*Dr. Ellis.*)

"Since philosophy has fallen into the hands of sincere and devout Christians, who valued above all learning "the faith delivered to the saints," and "contended" for that faith as the truest wisdom, it has been much reformed. But so long as it is human wisdom, it will never be fit to take the lead of revelation. Modern philosophers, as well as those of antiquity, whenever they attempt to model their creed by the rule of their reason, show themselves capable of the greatest absurdities. With our Unitarian divines, (as they are pleased exclusively to denominate themselves,) it is a first principle that "reason directs to whatever is true in speculation." To set reason free from the fetters of education, they have renounced the doctrine of human depravity, and of eternal punishment. Thus inspired with unlimited confidence in their own understanding, and divested of all apprehension of eternal consequences, they are 'induced to reason cautiously and frequently, and learn to reason well.' So says one of themselves.* And what can be more reasonably expected from them than that they should all reason alike?

* Mr. James Yates, in a sermon on the grounds of Unitarian dissent, preached at Glasgow, pp. 16, 17, 22, 23,

But their one, perfect, infallible, and unchangeable guide, which 'directs to whatever is true in speculation, is far from leading them all in the same path.' A few [illegible] from the author just mentioned will amply illustrate their agreements and their differences.

"'In order to convey a just idea of the constitution of Unitarian societies, it is necessary to premise, that, while we are united by a few great principles, there are numerous topics of inferior consequence respecting which we differ in opinion among ourselves. All Unitarians agree in denying that Jesus Christ was the eternal God; and that he is the object of religious worship. Some of them, however, believe that he was employed, as an instrument in the hands of the Deity, to create the material world, though not possessed of underived wisdom and independent power: others believe only in his pre-existence. Some go still farther, maintaining that he was simply a human being, but conceived in the womb of the virgin according to the introductory chapters of Matthew and Luke's Gospels: others see reason to believe that those chapters are interpolations, and therefore deny the doctrine of the miraculous conception. In like manner all Unitarians agree, that the death of Christ was an incalculable blessing to mankind: some, however, do not presume to determine the exact manner in which it conduces to the good of men, while others think that the mode of its beneficial operation may be distinctly pointed out; but all reject the Trinitarian doctrines of satisfaction and vicarious atonement, believing, not that Jesus saves his followers from the everlasting misery to which they are supposed to have been doomed in consequence of the sin of their first parents, but that he saves them, by the force of his doctrines, precepts, and example, from vice, ignorance, and superstition, and from the misery which is their natural result. The ordinance of baptism is a subject on which we entertain various opinions; some of us practise the baptism of infants, others of adults, and some think that

the use of water may be omitted entirely. Concerning the question of an intermediate state, and the philosophical doctrines of materialism and necessity, we either remain in doubt or espouse opposite sides. On these and other points, which have been debated by orthodox Christians with rancorous animosity, we agree to differ.' (*Mr. Yates' Sermon*, pp. 13—15.)

Mr. Yates ought to have the thanks of the Christian world for speaking the truth. This curious passage shows that reason, as well as nature, has her frolics. The 'few great principles' in which the Unitarians agree, Mr. Y. has carefully laid down; viz. 1. 'The free and unbiassed use of the understanding on religious subjects.' 2. 'They ought to offer prayer and adoration to God, the Father, only.' 3. 'They regard holiness of heart, and excellence of conduct, as the only means of obtaining salvation.'

"These three great Unitarian principles will not prevent the effect of our observations on the passage which we have cited.

"There is one part of this exposition of Unitarianism on which we may properly enough remark before we enter into the heart of it. Mr. Y. has shown that his friends are not yet agreed on 'the philosophical doctrines of materialism and necessity.' But ought they not to know from whence they take their departure, when they set out on their voyage of discovery? When Thales, while contemplating the stars, fell into a ditch, how, said a woman, should you know what passes in the heavens when you see not what is just at your feet? Again: ought they not to determine whether or not there is a spirit in them, before they assure themselves that they can without assistance from above find out God, who is a Spirit? An apostle thought that none but the spirit of a man can know what is in man. But they think that, without a spirit, they can know the things of God. If all the phenomena of perception, reason, memory, will, and various affections, joined with

But their one, perfect, infallible, and unchangeable guide, which 'directs to whatever is true in speculation,' is far from leading them all in the same path. A few lines from the author just mentioned will amply illustrate their agreements and their differences.

"'In order to convey a just idea of the constitution of Unitarian societies, it is necessary to premise, that, while we are united by a few great principles, there are numerous topics of inferior consequence respecting which we differ in opinion among ourselves. All Unitarians agree in denying that Jesus Christ was the eternal God; and that he is the object of religious worship. Some of them, however, believe that he was employed, as an instrument in the hands of the Deity, to create the material world, though not possessed of underived wisdom and independent power: others believe only in his pre-existence. Some go still farther, maintaining that he was simply a human being, but conceived in the womb of the virgin according to the introductory chapters of Matthew and Luke's Gospels: others see reason to believe that those chapters are interpolations, and therefore deny the doctrine of the miraculous conception. In like manner all Unitarians agree, that the death of Christ was an incalculable blessing to mankind: some, however, do not presume to determine the exact manner in which it conduces to the good of men, while others think that the mode of its beneficial operation may be distinctly pointed out; but all reject the Trinitarian doctrines of satisfaction and vicarious atonement, believing, not that Jesus saves his followers from the everlasting misery to which they are supposed to have been doomed in consequence of the sin of their first parents, but that he saves them, by the force of his doctrines, precepts, and example, from vice, ignorance, and superstition, and from the misery which is their natural result. The ordinance of baptism is a subject on which we entertain various opinions; some of us practise the baptism of infants, others of adults, and some think that

the use of water may be omitted entirely. Concerning the question of an intermediate state, and the philosophical doctrines of materialism and necessity, we either remain in doubt or espouse opposite sides. On these and other points, which have been debated by orthodox Christians with rancorous animosity, we agree to differ.' (*Mr. Yates' Sermon*, pp. 13—15.)

Mr. Yates ought to have the thanks of the Christian world for speaking the truth. This curious passage shows that reason, as well as nature, has her frolics. The 'few great principles' in which the Unitarians agree, Mr. Y. has carefully laid down; viz. 1. 'The free and unbiassed use of the understanding on religious subjects.' 2. 'They ought to offer prayer and adoration to God, the Father, only.' 3. 'They regard holiness of heart, and excellence of conduct, as the only means of obtaining salvation.'

"These three great Unitarian principles will not prevent the effect of our observations on the passage which we have cited.

"There is one part of this exposition of Unitarianism on which we may properly enough remark before we enter into the heart of it. Mr. Y. has shown that his friends are not yet agreed on 'the philosophical doctrines of materialism and necessity.' But ought they not to know from whence they take their departure, when they set out on their voyage of discovery? When Thales, while contemplating the stars, fell into a ditch, how, said a woman, should you know what passes in the heavens when you see not what is just at your feet? Again: ought they not to determine whether or not there is a spirit in them, before they assure themselves that they can without assistance from above find out God, who is a Spirit? An apostle thought that none but the spirit of a man can know what is in man. But they think that, without a spirit, they can know the things of God. If all the phenomena of perception, reason, memory, [illegible]

the unequivocal and uniform testimony of Divine revelation, cannot assure a Unitarian that he has a spirit distinct from his body, how can his reason prove to itself that there is a God who is a Spirit? Where then is the reason, which is 'a partial revelation of God, his nature, attributes, and will?' If a man's reason be not satisfied on this point, how can he on Unitarian principles believe the testimony of a revelation which contradicts his reason? Or, if a contradiction be not admitted, how can his reason be a fit rule by which to judge whether that doctrine of revelation be true. This one concession is subversive of the whole fabric of Unitarianism, which is like a kingdom divided against itself. Once more: ought they not to be assured that their (what name should it have?) spirit is free, has liberty, and is not bound down by the chains of irresistible necessity, before they assure themselves that they are entering on a free inquiry?

"Leaving them to consider how far it is proper to begin their reasonings where they now end them, let us examine the points in which they agree, and those in which they differ.

1. "Their agreement is all in negatives. They are only agreed about what is not. They agree in denying that Jesus Christ is the eternal God, or the object of religious worship; and in rejecting the doctrines of satisfaction and vicarious atonement, as well as the doctrine of original sin and everlasting punishment. That is, they agree in renouncing these doctrines of the Bible.

2. "But in things positive, though led by the same infallible guide, 'which directs to whatever is true in speculation,' they agree not at all. They are not agreed whether Jesus Christ was the 'instrumental' Creator of the world, or a mere man. They are not agreed in what manner the world is benefitted by the death of Christ. They are not agreed whether baptism, (i. e. washing,) should be administered with or without wa-

ter! *Risum teneatis?* They are not agreed whether they have an immortal soul; or whether they have any soul at all; whether they are walking in glorious liberty, or are bound in the adamantine chains of inexorable necessity! Such are the consistencies of all-searching, all-discerning, all-knowing reason! When men, instead of ascending to heaven on a ladder let down from above, agree to build a tower of which the foundation shall be on earth, and the summit shall reach the skies, no wonder that God confounds their language!

"To bring to light this disagreement among themselves, was the design with which Mr. Yates was cited. The citation is intended to show, first,—that as the heathen philosophers, without the aid of revelation, could discover and detect error, but could not find out truth, or agree among themselves on that great question, What is truth? and therefore could never enlighten the world by their instructions; so, when philosophical divines bring the doctrines of revelation to the test of human reason, and make their own conceptions the rule by which they are to judge, they can easily agree to discard many points of doctrine which in their own opinion ought not to be taught, because they are false, but have among themselves no positive revealed truth on which they are agreed, and therefore are as unfit to instruct mankind as their elder brethren: and secondly—that as by the philosophy which some of the first Christian teachers adopted, Christianity was neutralized; so by the negative and skeptical philosophy of modern teachers, Christianity is destroyed."—*Hare.*

"'In whatever point of view,' says an able author, 'the subject be placed, the same arguments which show the incapability of man, by the light of nature, to *discover* religious truth, will serve likewise to show, that, when it is *revealed* to him, he is not warranted in *judging* of it merely by the notions which he had previously formed. For is it not a solecism to affirm, that man's natural reason is a fit standard for measuring the wis-

dom or truth of those things with which it is wholly unacquainted, except so far as they have been supernaturally revealed?'

'But what, then,' (an objector will say,) 'is the province of reason? Is it altogether useless? Or are we to be precluded from using it in this most important of all concerns, for our security against error?'

"Our answer is, that we do not lessen either the utility or the dignity of human reason, by thus confining the exercise of it within those natural boundaries which the Creator himself hath assigned to it. We admit, with the Deist, that 'Reason is the foundation of all certitude:' and we admit, therefore, that it is fully competent to judge of the *credibility* of any thing which is proposed to it as a Divine revelation. But we deny that it has a right to dispute (because we maintain that it has not the ability to disprove) the *wisdom* or the *truth* of those things which revelation proposes to its acceptance. Reason is to judge whether those things be indeed so revealed: and this judgment it is to form, from the *evidence* to that effect. In this respect it is 'the foundation of certitude,' because it enables us to ascertain the *fact*, that God hath spoken to us. But this fact once established, the credibility, nay, the certainty of the things revealed, follows as of necessary consequence; since no deduction of reason can be more indubitable than this, that whatever God reveals must be true. Here, then, the authority of reason ceases. Its judgment is finally determined by the fact of the revelation itself: and it has thenceforth nothing to do, but to believe and to obey.

"'But are we to believe every doctrine, however incomprehensible, however mysterious, nay, however seemingly contradictory to sense and reason?'

"We answer, that revelation is supposed to treat of subjects with which man's natural reason is not conversant. It is therefore to be expected, that it should communicate some truths not to be fully comprehended

by human understandings. But these we may safely receive, upon the *authority* which declares them, without danger of violating truth. *Real* and *evident* contradictions, no man can, indeed, believe, whose intellects are sound and clear. But such contradictions are no more proposed for our belief, than impossibilities are enjoined for our practice: though things difficult to understand, as well as things hard to perform, may perhaps be required of us, for the trial of our faith and resolution. *Seeming* contradictions may also occur: but these may seem to be such because they are slightly or superficially considered, or because they are judged of by principles inapplicable to the subject, and without so clear a knowledge of the nature of the things revealed, as may lead us to form an adequate conception of them. These, however, afford no solid argument against the truth of what is proposed to our belief: since, unless we had really such an insight into the mysterious parts of revelation as might enable us to prove them to be contradictory and false, we have no good ground for rejecting them; and we only betray our own ignorance and perverseness in refusing to take God's word for the truth of things which pass man's understanding.

"The simple question, indeed, to be considered, is, whether it be reasonable to believe, upon competent *authority*, things which we can neither discover ourselves, nor, when discovered, fully and clearly comprehend? Now every person of common observation must be aware, that unless he be content to receive solely upon the testimony of others a great variety of information, much of which he may be wholly unable to account for or explain, he could scarcely obtain a competency of knowledge to carry him safely through the common concerns of life. And with respect to scientific truths, the greatest masters in philosophy know full well that many things are reasonably to be believed, nay, must be believed on sure and certain grounds of con-

viction, though they are absolutely incomprehensible by our understandings, and even so difficult to be reconciled with other truths of equal certainty, as to carry the *appearance* of being contradictory and impossible. This will serve to show, that it is not *contrary to reason* to believe, on sufficient authority, some things which cannot be comprehended, and some things which, from the narrow and circumscribed views we are able to take of them, appear to be repugnant to our notions of truth. The ground on which we believe such things, is the strength and certainty of the *evidence* with which they are accompanied. And this is precisely the ground on which we are required to believe the truths of revealed religion. The *evidence* that *they come from God*, is, to reason itself, as incontrovertible a proof that they are true, as in matters of human science would be the evidence of sense, or of mathematical demonstration."—*Watson.*

CHAPTER II.

ON THE IMPORTANCE OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

"Before we enter upon the examination of the scriptural proofs of the Trinity, it will be necessary to impress the reader with a sense of the *importance* of this revealed doctrine; and the more so as it has been a part of the subtle warfare of the enemies of this fundamental branch of the common faith, to represent it as of little consequence, or as a matter of useless speculation. Thus, Dr. Priestley, 'All that can be said for it is, that the doctrine, however improbable in itself, is necessary to explain some particular texts of Scripture; and that, if it had not been for those particular texts, we should have found no want of it, for there is neither any fact

in nature, nor any one purpose of morals, which are the object and end of all religion, that requires it.'

"The non-importance of the doctrine has been a favorite subject with its opposers in all ages, that by allaying all fears in the minds of the unwary, as to the consequences of the opposite errors, they might be put off their guard, and be the more easily persuaded to part with 'the faith delivered to the saints.' The answer is, however, obvious.

1. "The knowledge of God is *fundamental* to religion; and as we know nothing of him but what he has been pleased to reveal, and as these revelations have all *moral* ends, and are designed to promote *piety* and not to gratify *curiosity*, all that he has revealed of himself in *particular*, must partake of that character of fundamental importance, which belongs to the knowledge of God in the aggregate. 'This is *life eternal*, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.' Nothing, therefore, can disprove the fundamental importance of the Trinity in Unity, but that which will disprove it to be a doctrine of Scripture.

2. "Dr. Priestley allows, that this doctrine 'is necessary to explain some particular texts of Scripture.' This alone is sufficient to mark its importance; especially as it can be shown, that these '*particular* texts of Scripture' comprehend a very large portion of the sacred volume; that they are scattered throughout almost all the books of both Testaments; that they are not incidentally introduced only, but solemnly laid down as revelations of the nature of God; and that they manifestly give the *tone* both to the *thinking* and the *phrase* of the sacred writers on many other weighty subjects. That which is necessary to explain so many passages of holy writ; and without which, they are so incorrigibly unmeaning, that Unitarians have felt themselves obliged to submit to their evidence, or to expunge them from the inspired record, carries with it an

importance of the highest character. So important, indeed, is it, upon the showing of these opposers of the truth themselves, that we can only preserve the Scriptures by admitting it; for they, first by excepting to the genuineness of certain passages, then by questioning the inspiration of whole books, and, finally, of the greater part, if not the whole New Testament, have nearly left themselves as destitute of a revelation from God, as Infidels themselves. No homage more expressive has ever been paid to this doctrine, as the doctrine of the Scriptures, than the liberties thus taken with the Bible, by those who have denied it; no stronger proof can be offered of its importance, than that the Bible *cannot be interpreted upon any substituted theory*, they themselves being the judges.

3. "It *essentially* affects our views of God as the object of our worship, whether we regard him as one in essence, and one in person, or admit that in the unity of this Godhead there are three equally Divine persons. These are two very different conceptions. Both cannot be true. The God of those who deny the Trinity, is not the God of those who worship the Trinity in Unity, nor on the contrary; so that one or the other worships what is 'nothing in the world;' and, for any *reality* in the object of worship, might as well worship a Pagan idol, which also, says St. Paul, 'is nothing in the world.' 'If God be Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the duties owing to God will be duties owing to that triune distinction, which must be paid accordingly; and whoever leaves any of them out of his idea of God, comes so far short of honoring God perfectly, and of serving him in proportion to the manifestations he has made of himself.'

As the *object* of our worship is affected by our respective views on this great subject, so also its *character*. We are betwixt the extremes of pure and acceptable devotion, and of gross and offensive idolatry, and must run to one or the other. If the doctrine of the

Trinity be true, then those who deny it do not worship the God of the Scriptures, but a fiction of their own framing; if it be false, the Trinitarian, by paying Divine honors to the Son and to the Holy Ghost, is equally guilty of idolatry, though in another mode.

"Now it is surely important to determine this; and which is the most likely to have fallen into this false and corrupt worship, the very *prima facie* evidence may determine:—the Trinitarian, who has the *letter, and plain common-sense interpretation of Scripture* for his warrant;—or he who confesses, that he must resort to all the artifices of criticism, and boldly challenge the inspiration of an authenticated volume, to get rid of the evidence which it exhibits against him, if taken in its first and most obvious meaning. It is not now attempted to prove the Unitarian heresy from the Scriptures; this has long been given up, and the main effort of all modern writers on that side has been directed to cavil at the adduced proofs of the opposite doctrine. They are, as to Scripture argument, wholly on the *defensive*, and thus allow, at least, that they have no direct warrant for their opinions. We acknowledge, indeed, that the charge of idolatry would lie against us, could we be proved in error; but they seem to forget, that it lies against them, should they be in error; and that they are in this error, they themselves tacitly acknowledge, if the Scriptures, which they now, in a great measure, reject, must determine the question. On that authority, we may unhesitatingly account them idolaters, worshippers of what 'is nothing in the world;' and not of the God revealed in the Bible. Thus, the only hope which is left to the Unitarian, is held on the same tenure as the hope of the Deist,—the forlorn hope that the Scriptures, which he rejects, are not true; for if those texts they reject, and those books which they hold of no authority, be established, then this whole charge, and its consequences, lie full against them.

4. "Our *love to God*, which is the sum of every duty,

its sanctifying motive, and consequently a compendium of all true religion, is most intimately and even essentially connected with the doctrine in question. God's love to us is the ground of our love to him; and by our views of that, it must be heightened or diminished. The love of God to man in the gift of his Son is that manifestation of it on which the Scriptures most emphatically and frequently dwell, and on which they establish our duty of loving God and one another. Now the estimate which we are to take of the love of God, must be the value of his gifts to us. His greatest gift is the gift of his Son, through whom alone we have the promise of everlasting life; but our estimate of the love which *gives* must be widely different, according as we regard the *gift* bestowed,—as a creature, or as a Divine person,—as merely a Son of man, or as the Son of God. If the former only, it is difficult to conceive in what this love, constantly represented as '*unspeakable*' and astonishing, could consist. Indeed, if we suppose Christ to be a man only, on the Socinian scheme, or as an exalted creature, according to the Arians, God might be rather said to have '*so loved his Son*' than us, as to send him into the world, on a service so honorable and which was to be followed by so high and vast a reward, that he, a *creature*, should be advanced to universal dominion and receive universal homage as the price only of temporary sufferings, which, upon either the Socinian or Arian scheme, were not greater than those which many of his disciples endured after him, and, in many instances, not so great.

"For the same reason, the doctrine which denies our Lord's divinity diminishes the love of Christ himself, takes away its *generosity* and *devotedness*, presents it under views infinitely below those contained in the New Testament, and weakens the motives which are drawn from it to excite our gratitude and obedience. 'If Christ was in the form of God, equal with God, and very God, it was then an act of infinite love and con-

descension in him to become man; but if he was no more than a creature, it was no surprising condescension to embark in a work so glorious; such as being the Saviour of mankind, and such as would advance him to be Lord and Judge of the world, to be admired, reverenced, and adored, both by men and angels.'—*Waterland.* To this it may be added, that the idea of disinterested, generous love, such as the love Christ is represented to be by the Evangelists and the Apostles, cannot be supported upon any supposition but that he was properly a Divine person. As a man and as a creature only, however exalted, he would have profited by his exaltation; but, considered as Divine, Christ gained nothing. God is full and perfect—he is exalted 'above blessing and praise.' The whole, therefore, was in him *generous, disinterested love,* ineffable and affecting condescension. The heresy of the Socinians and Arians totally annihilates, therefore, the true character of the love of Christ, 'so that,' as Dr. Sherlock well observes, 'to deny the Divinity of Christ alters the very foundations of Christianity, and destroys all the powerful arguments of the *love, humility,* and *condescension* of our Lord, which are the peculiar motives of the Gospel.'—*Stillingfleet.*

"But it is not only in this view that the denial of the Divinity of our Lord would alter the foundation of the Christian scheme, but in others equally essential; For,

1. "The doctrine of satisfaction or atonement depends upon his Divinity; and it is, therefore, consistently denied by those who reject the former. So important, however, is the decision of this case, that the very terms of our salvation, and the ground of our hope, are affected by it.

"'No *creature* could *merit* from God, or do works of supererogation. If it be said that God might accept it as he pleased, it may be said, upon the same principle, that he might accept the blood of bulls and of goats. Yet the Apostle tells us, that *it is not possible that the*

blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin; which words resolve the satisfaction, not merely into God's free acceptance, but into the *intrinsic value* of the sacrifice.'—*Waterland.* Hence the Scriptures so constantly connect the atonement with the character,—the very *Divinity* of the person suffering. It was *Jehovah* who was pierced, Zech. xii. 11; *God*, who purchased the church with *his own blood*, Acts xx. 28. It was the *Lord*, that bought us, 2 Pet. ii. 1. It was the *Lord of glory* that was crucified, 1 Cor. ii. 8.

"It is no small presumption of the impossibility of holding, with any support from the common sense of mankind, the doctrine of atonement with that of an inferior Divinity, that these opinions have so uniformly slided down into a total denial of it; and by almost all persons, except those who have retained the pure faith of the Gospel, Christ is regarded as a man only; and no atonement, in any sense, is allowed to have been made by his death. The terms, then, of human salvation are entirely different on one scheme and on the other; and with respect to their advocates, one is 'under *law*,' the other 'under *grace*;' one takes the cause of his own salvation into his own hands, to manage it as he is able, and to plead with God, either that he is just, or that he may be justified by his own penitence and acts of obedient virtue; the other pleads the meritorious death and intercession of his Saviour; in his name and mediation makes his requests known unto God; and asks a justification by faith, and a renewal of heart by the Holy Ghost. One stands with all his offences before his Maker, and in his own person, without a mediator and advocate; the other avails himself of both. A question which involves such consequences, is surely not a speculative one; but deeply practical and vital, and must be found to be so in its final issue.

2. "It totally changes the character of Christian experience. Those strong and painful emotions of sorrow and alarm, which characterize the descriptions and

example of REPENTANCE in the Scriptures, are totally incongruous and uncalled for, upon the theory which denies man's *lost* condition, and his salvation by a process of *redemption*. FAITH, too, undergoes an essential change. It is no longer faith *in Christ*. His *doctrine* or his *mission* are its objects; but not, as the New Testament states it, his *person*, as a surety, a sacrifice, a mediator: and much less than any thing else can it be called, in the language of Scripture, '*faith in his* BLOOD,' a phrase utterly incapable of an interpretation by Unitarians. Nor is it possible to offer up PRAYER to God in the *name* of Christ, though expressly enjoined upon his disciples, in any sense which would not justify all the idolatry of the Roman Church, in availing themselves of the *names*, the interests, and the *merits* of saints.

3. "LOVE *to Christ*, which is made so eminent a grace in internal and experimental Christianity, changes also its character. It cannot be *supreme*, for that would be to break the first and great command, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart,' if Christ himself be not that Lord our God. It must be love of the same kind we feel to *creatures* from whom we have received any benefit, and a passion, therefore, to be *guarded* and restrained, lest it should become excessive and wean our hearts and thoughts from God. But surely it is not under such views that love to Christ is represented in the Scriptures; and against its excess, as against creaturely attachments, we have certainly no admonition, no cautions.

4. "The general and habitual exercises of the affections of TRUST, HOPE, JOY, &c. towards Christ, are all interfered with by the Unitarian doctrine. This has, in part, been stated; but 'if the Redeemer were not omnipresent and omniscient, could we be certain that he always hears our prayers, and knows the source and remedy of all our miseries? If he were not all-merciful, could we be certain he must always be willing to par-

don and relieve us? If he were not all powerful, could we be sure that he must always be able to support and strengthen, to enlighten and direct us? Of any less being than God, we might suspect that his purposes might waver, his promises fail, his existence itself, perhaps terminate; for, of every created being, the existence must be dependent and terminable.'

The *language*, too, I say not of the Church of Christ in all ages, for that that has been formed upon her faith, but of the Scriptures themselves, must be altered and brought down to these inferior views. No dying saint can say, 'Lord Jesus, receive my spirit,' if he be a man like ourselves; and the redeemed neither in heaven nor in earth can dare to associate a creature so with God in divine honors and solemn worship, as to unite in the chorus, "Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power be unto HIM that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the *Lamb*, for ever!'

"The same essential changes must be made in the doctrine of *Divine agency* in the heart of man, and in the church, and the same confusion introduced into the language of Scripture. 'Our salvation by Christ does not consist only in the expiation of our sins, &c., but in communication of divine grace and power, to renew and sanctify us: and this is every where in Scripture attributed to the *Holy Spirit*, as his peculiar office in the economy of man's salvation: it must therefore make a *fundamental change* in the doctrine of divine grace and assistance, to deny the Divinity of the Holy Spirit. For can a creature be the universal spring and fountain of divine grace and life! Can a *finite* creature be a kind of universal soul to the whole Christian Church, and to every sincere member of it? Can a creature make such close application to our minds, know our thoughts, set bounds to our passions, inspire us with new affections and desires, and to be more intimate to us than we are to ourselves? If a creature be the only instrument and principle of grace, we shall soon be tempted

either to deny the grace of God, or to make it an external thing, and entertain very mean conceits of it. All this has been felt so forcibly by the deniers of the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, that they have escaped only by taking another leap down the gulf of error; and at present the Unitarians deny that there is any Holy Ghost, and resolve the whole into a figure of speech.

"But the importance of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity may be finally argued from the manner in which the denial of it would affect *the credit of the Holy Scriptures* themselves; for if this doctrine be not contained in them, their tendency to mislead is obvious. Their constant language is so adapted to deceive, and to compel the belief of falsehood, even in fundamental points, and to lead to the practice of idolatry itself, that they would lose all claim to be regarded as a revelation from the God of truth, and ought rather to be shunned than to be studied. A great part of the Scriptures is directed against idolatry, which is declared to be 'that abominable thing which the Lord hateth;' and in pursuance of this design, the doctrine that there is but *one* God is laid down in the most explicit terms, and constantly confirmed by appeals to his works. The very first command in the decalogue is, 'Thou shalt have no other gods before me;' and the sum of the law, as to our duty to God, is, that we love HIM 'with all our heart, and mind, and soul, and strength.' If the doctrine of a Trinity of Divine persons in the unity of the Godhead be consistent with all this, then the style and manner of the Scriptures are in perfect accordance with the moral ends they propose, and the truths in which they would instruct mankind; but if the Son and the Holy Spirit are creatures, then is the language of the sacred books most deceptive and dangerous. For how is it to be accounted for, in that case, that in the Old Testament, God should be spoken of in plural terms, and that this plurality should be restricted to three? How is it that the very name *Jehovah* should ge given to each

of them, and that repeatedly, and on the most solemn occasions? How is it that the promised incarnate Messiah should be invested, in the prophecies of his advent, with the loftiest attributes of God, and that works infinitely superhuman, and divine honors should be predicted of him? and that acts and characters of unequivocal divinity, according to the common apprehensions of mankind should be ascribed to the Spirit also? How is it that, in the New Testament, the name of *God* should be given to both, and that without any intimation that it is to be taken in an inferior sense? That the *creation* and *conservation* of all things should be ascribed to Christ; that he should be *worshipped* by angels and by men; that he should be represented as seated on the throne of the universe, to receive the adorations of all creatures; and that in the very form of initiation by baptism into his church, itself a public and solemn profession of faith, the baptism is enjoined to be performed in the *one name* of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost? One God and two *creatures!* As though the very door of entrance into the Christian Church should have been purposely made the gate of the worst and most corrupting error ever introduced among mankind—*trust and worship in creatures, as God;* the error which has spread darkness and moral desolation over the whole pagan world!

And here it cannot be said that the question is begged—that more is taken for granted than Unitarians will allow; for this argument does not rest at all upon what the denier's of our Lord's Divinity understand by all these terms, and what interpretations may be put upon them. This is the popular view of the subject which has just been drawn from the Scriptures; and they themselves acknowledge it by resorting to the arts and labors of far-fetched criticism, in order to attach to these passages of Scripture a sense different to the obvious and popular one. It is so taken, and has been taken in all ages, by the wisest men and most competent critics,

to be the only consistent senses of the sacred volume; a circumstance which still more strongly proves, that if the Scriptures were written on Unitarian principles they are more unfortunately expressed than any book in the world; and they can, on no account, be considered a Divine Revelation, not because of their obscurity, for they are not obscure, but because terms are used in them which convey a sense different from what the writers intended, if indeed they were Unitarians. But their evidences prove them to be a revelation of *truth*, from the God of *truth*, and they cannot therefore be so written as to lead men, who use only ordinary care, into fundamental error; and the conclusion, therefore, must inevitably be, that if we must admit either on the one hand what is so derogatory to the Scriptures, and so subversive of all confidence in them, or, on the other, that the doctrine of the Divinity of the Son and Holy Spirit is there explicitly taught, these is no medium between absolute infidelity and the acknowledgment of our Lord's Divinity; and, indeed, to adopt the representation of a great divine, it is rather to rave than to reason, to suppose that he whom the Scriptures teach us to regard as the Saviour of our souls, and as our wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption; he who hears our prayers, and is always present with his Church throughout the world, who sits at the right hand of God, in the glory of his Father, and who shall come at the last day, in glory and majesty, accompanied with ministering angels, to judge all mankind and to bring to light the very secrets of their hearts, should be a mere *man*, or a *created being* of any kind."—*Watson.*

CHAPTER III.

PERSONALITY AND DIVINITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

"When the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is considered in its connection with the doctrine of the trinity, there are two points nearly related to each other, which claim our attention: viz. I. Whether the Holy Spirit be a mere energy, or a real person? II. Whether he be a creature, or God?

I. "In entering upon the first of these inquiries, it is necessary to state distinctly, that we are not at present inquiring whether the Holy Spirit be a third person in the Godhead. With that question we have here nothing to do. Our object is, to ascertain whether the Holy Spirit be, on the one hand, the mere operation of God, or, on the other hand, an intelligent and voluntary agent, i. e. a person." And,

1. "The mode of his subsistence in the sacred Trinity proves his Personality. He *proceeds* from the Father and the Son, and cannot, therefore, be either. To say that an attribute proceeds and comes forth would be a gross absurdity.

2. "From so many Scriptures being wholly unintelligible and even absurd, unless the Holy Ghost is allowed to be a person. For as those who take the phrase as ascribing no more than a figurative Personality to an attribute, make that attribute to be the *energy* or *power* of God, they reduce such passages as the following to utter unmeaningness: 'God anointed Jesus with the Holy Ghost and with *power*,' that is, with the power of God and with power. 'That ye may abound in hope through the power of the Holy Ghost,' that is, through the power of power. 'In demonstration of the Spirit and of power,' that is, in demonstration of power and of power. And if it should be pleaded that the last

passage is a Hebraism for 'powerful demonstration of the Spirit,' it makes the interpretation still more obviously absurd, for it would then be 'the powerful demonstration of power.' 'It seemed good to the Holy Ghost,' to the power of God, 'and to us.' 'The Spirit and the bride say, Come,'—the power of God and the bride say, Come. Modern Unitarians, from Dr. Priestley to Mr. Belsham, venture to find fault with the style of the Apostles in some instances; and those penmen of the Holy Spirit have, indeed, a very unfortunate method of expressing themselves for those who would make them the patrons of Unitarianism; but they would more justly deserve the censures of these judges of the 'words which the Holy Ghost' taught, had they been really such writers as the Unitarian scheme would make them, and of which the above are instances.

3. "Personification of any kind is, in some passages in which the Holy Ghost is spoken of, impossible. The reality which this figure of speech is said to present to us is either some of the attributes of God, or else the doctrine of the Gospel. Let this theory, then, be tried upon the following passages: 'He shall not speak of *himself*, but whatsoever he shall *hear*, that shall he speak.' What attribute of God can here be personified? And if the doctrine of the Gospel be arrayed with personal attributes, where is there an instance of so monstrous a prosopopæia as this passage would present?—the doctrine of the Gospel not speaking 'of himself' but speaking 'whatsoever he shall hear!'—'The Spirit maketh intercession for us.' What attribute is capable of interceding, or how can the doctrine of the Gospel intercede? Personification, too, is the language of poetry, and takes place naturally only in excited and elevated discourse; but if the Holy Spirit be a personification, we find it in the ordinary and cool strain of mere narration and argumentative discourse in the New Testament, and in the most incidental conver-

sations. 'Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost.' How impossible is it here to extort, by any process whatever, even the shadow of a personification of either any attribute of God, or of the doctrine of the Gospel. So again, 'The Spirit said unto Philip, Go near, and join thyself to this chariot.' Could it be any attribute of God which said this, or could it be the doctrine of the Gospel."—*Watson.*

4. That the Holy Ghost is a person, and not an attribute, is proved by the use of masculine pronouns and relatives in the Greek of the New Testament, in connection with the neuter noun Spirit; and by so many distinct personal acts being ascribed to him, as in the following passages of Scripture: He *creates* and *gives life*, Job xxxiii. 4, is seen descending *in a bodily shape*, Luke iii. 22, commands apostles, Acts viii. 29, and xi. 12, lifts up an apostle through the air by his own power, v. 39, sends messengers, Acts x. 19, appoints ministers in the church, Acts xx. 28, calls apostles, Acts xiii. 2, bestows gifts, Heb. ii. 4, speaketh to the churches, Rev. ii. 7, spake by the prophets, Acts xxviii. 15, 2 Pet. i. 21, speaketh *expressly*, 1 Tim. iv. 1, renews his people, Titus iii. 5, helpeth infirmities, Rom. viii. 26, maketh intercession, Rom. viii. 26, reveals mysteries, Eph. iii. 5, searcheth all things, 1 Cor. ii. 10, teacheth all things, John xiv. 26, guideth into all truth, John xvi. 13, beareth witness in earth and heaven, Rom. viii. 16, 1 John v. 6, pronounceth worth of blessing, Rev. xiv. 13, testifies of Christ, John xv. 26, glorifies Christ, John xvi. 14, is ANOTHER *Comforter*, distinct from Christ, John xiv. 16, has a *mind* of his own, Rom. viii. 27, has a *will* of his own, 1 Cor. xii. 11, has a *power* of his own, Rom. xv. 13, has worship performed in his name, together with the Father and Son, Matt. xxviii. 19, has a temple for his worship, 1 Cor. vi. 15, abides with his people forever, John xiv. 16, and, by no people is blasphemed, but upon the peril of damnation, Matt. xii. 31.

In addition to this, it may be remarked, that if the Holy Spirit is nothing but an attribute, and not a person, he must be destitute of intelligence, for how can an attribute be said to know? Is not the idea of personality and intelligence inseperably connected? If so, then a denial of the one amounts to a denial of the other. This is conceded by the Unitarians. The concession was once made in the presence of the writer by the Rev. James Hayes, while in public controversy. Being asked by the Rev. John H. Power if the Comforter, "which is the Holy Ghost," that the Saviour promised to send into the world, was God the Father, he answered, No. Was it a person? He replied, No. Was it an agent? He said, Yes. Was it an intelligent agent? He responded, No. Consequently we were led to the conclusion that the Holy Ghost which was to reprove the world of sin, of righteousness, and of a judgment to come—which was to comfort and sanctify the children of God, was perfectly ignorant, an unintelligent agent.

This imputation of perfect ignorance to the Holy Ghost is not peculiar, however, to Mr. Hayes. It necessarily follows from a denial of his personality, and is, we believe, admitted by a majority of Unitarians.

We will now pass to answer some objections urged against the personality of the Holy Spirit. The first is based upon certain figurative expressions, and is thus stated by Mr. Millard, in his True Messiah, pp. 83.

"The Spirit is represented as something with which a person can be anointed. 'The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath *anointed* me to preach good tidings unto the meek.' Isa. lxi. 1. The Lord Jesus in this passage, is represented as one whom the Lord God had aniointed with his Spirit. In another passage this same Spirit is called *oil.*"

"Now I would ask my candid reader how he can form any consistent idea of those passages of Scripture, if he believe the Holy Ghost to be a person? It is rep-

resented by *ὄιl*, and by an unction which God is represented as anointing his Son with. God said, 'I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh.' Acts ii. 17. Here the Spirit is represented as something that may be *poured out.*"

Mr. Grundy says:

"The Holy Spirit is said to be given by measure; to be poured out; the disciples are said to be filled and baptized with it; it is said to be quenched; and in several instances it is said to be divided. How do these sayings agree with the idea of his personality?" Vol. i. pp. 166, 168.

In this objection we are presented with a literary curiosity! How is it that Unitarians who are perpetually dreaming about metaphors, can see none here? When they are determined to interpret all these Scriptural expressions literally, do they not seize the long sought opportunity to prove that the Spirit is not spirit, but matter? What but matter, which is an extended substance, can be measured, divided, poured out? What but fire, which is matter, can be extinguished? And wherewith can any man be washed but with water, which is another species of matter? And lastly, what is spirit but breath or wind, that is air which is also material? Thus the demonstration is complete, and the favorite system of materialism is triumphant. But every unprejudiced person will at once see that all these are figurative expressions, by which the properties of matter are predicated of spirit; and therefore that every argument founded upon the literal interpretation of them must fall to the ground. Unless Unitarians seriously intend to deny all spirituality of the Spirit, they will find that this objection is leveled against their own as much as the common hypothesis. They think it 'perfectly rational to suppose that the Divine attributes were divided, measured, and poured out, or that persons were baptized with them, or quenched them.' Now let them be asked, What is the cubic measure of any one of the

Divine attributes? Into how many parts is it divisible? What quantity of it will fill a man of ordinary stature? After a division of it into many parts, do these parts attract each other again, or does division annihilate some of them? What becomes of it when it is quenched? "O," say Unitarians, "these are figurative expressions." The answer is satisfactory; but equally so as a reply to their objections to the personality of the Holy Spirit.

Their next objection is founded on the supposed ignorance of the Holy Spirit. Because our Lord has said, "No one knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any one the Father save the Son," Unitarians infer that the Holy Spirit knew neither the Father nor the Son, without a special revelation. From hence they argue that "the Holy Spirit cannot possibly be a person in the Godhead distinct from the Father."

This argument is founded on a gross mistake. For, as we have already seen, "the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God." What is here said of the Father and the Son, is therefore asserted also of the Holy Ghost. "No one knoweth the things of God, but the Spirit of God, and he to whom the Spirit of God shall reveal them." Will Unitarians now draw the same inference concerning the Father and the Son?

Lastly: The expressions of the Holy Spirit being given by the Father, and sent by Jesus Christ, are said to be incompatible with the idea of its being a person.

What an argument! So the Son of God was not a person, because, forsooth, "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son," John iii. 16; and because the Father "sent him into the world." But for this Unitarians have an answer. We are informed that Jesus Christ "came voluntarily." But if it had not been expressly said that Jesus Christ came voluntarily into the world, they would have denied him the honor of personality. And yet every one of us came into the world involuntarily.

II. Having, as we consider, established the proper personality of the Holy Spirit, upon the authority of the word of God, we shall now pass to offer some additional arguments, going to show not only that he is a person, but that he is a Divine Person, and consequently God.

1. "The SPIRIT is represented as an agent in creation, 'moving upon the face of the waters,' and it forms no objection to the argument, that creation is ascribed to the Father, and also to the Son, but great confirmation of it. That creation should be effected be all the three Persons of the Godhead, though acting in different respects, yet so that each should be a *Creator*, and, therefore, both a Person, and a Divine Person, can be explained only by their unity in one essence. On every other hypothesis this Scriptural *fact* is disallowed, and therefore no other hypothesis can be true. If the Spirit of God be a mere influence, then he is not a *Creator*, distinct from the Father and the Son, because he is not a person; but this is refuted, both by the passage just quoted and by Pslam xxxii. 6, "By the WORD OF THE LORD were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the BREATH (Heb. SPIRIT) of his mouth." This is farther confirmed by Job xxxiii. 4, 'The SPIRIT OF GOD hath made me, and the *breath of the Almighty* hath given me life;' where the second clause is obviously exegetic of the former, and the whole text proves that, in the patriarchal age, the followers of the true religion ascribed creation to the Spirit, as well as to the Father; and that one of his appellations was 'the BREATH of the Almighty.' Did such passages stand alone, there might, indeed, be some plausibility in the criticism which solves them by a personification; but connected as they are with that whole body of evidence, which has been and shall be adduced, as to the concurring doctrine of both Testaments, they are inexpungable. Again: if the Personality of the Son and the Spirit be allowed, and yet it is contended that they

were but *instruments* in creation, through whom the creative power of *another* operated, but which creative power was not possessed by them; on this hypothesis, too, neither the Spirit nor the Son can be said to *create*, any more than Moses created the serpent into which his rod was turned, and the Scriptures are again contradicted. To this association of three Persons in creative acts may be added a like association in acts of PRESERVATION, which has been well called a continued *creation*, and by that term is expressed in the following passage: Psalm civ. 27-30, 'These wait all upon thee, that thou mayest give them their meat in due season. Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled; thou takest away their breath, they die, and return to dust: thou SENDEST FORTH THY SPIRIT, they are created, and thou renewest the face of the earth.' It is not surely here meant that the Spirit, by which the generations of animals are perpetuated, is *wind*; and if he be called an attribute, wisdom, power, or both united, where do we read of such attributes being 'sent,' 'sent forth from God?' The personality of the Spirit is here as clearly marked as when St. Paul speaks of God 'sending forth the Spirit of his Son,' and when our Lord promises to "*send*" the Comforter; and as the upholding and preserving of created things is ascribed to the Father and the Son, so here they are ascribed, also, to the Spirit, 'sent forth from' God to 'create and renew the face of the earth.'

2. "The next association of the three Persons we find in the *inspiration* of the prophets. 'God spake unto our fathers by the prophets,' says St. Paul, Heb. i. 1. St. Peter declares, these 'holy men of God spake as they were moved by the HOLY GHOST,' 2 Pet. i. 21; and also that it was the Spirit of CHRIST which was in them,' 1 Pet. i. 11. We may defy any Unitarian to interpret these three passages by making the Spirit an influence or attribute, and thereby reducing the term Holy Ghost into a figure of speech. '*God*,' in the

first passages, is, unquestionably, God the Father, and the 'holy men of God,' the prophets, would then, according to this view, be moved by the *influence* of the Father; but the influence, according to the third passage, which was the source of their inspiration, was the Spirit, or the *influence* of 'Christ.' Thus the passages contradict each other. Allow the Trinity in unity, and you have no difficulty in calling the Spirit, the Spirit of the Father, and Spirit of the Son, or the Spirit of either; but if the Spirit be an influence, that influence cannot be the influence of two persons, on God and the other a creature.

3. "The very important fact, that, in the vision of Isaiah, chapter vi, the LORD OF HOSTS, who spake unto the prophet, is, in Acts xxviii. 25, said to be the HOLY GHOST who spake to the prophet, while St. John declares that the glory which Isaiah saw was the *glory of* CHRIST, proves indisputably, that each of three Persons bears this august appellation; it gives also the reason for the threefold repetition 'HOLY, HOLY, HOLY,' and it exhibits the prophet and the very seraphs in deep and awful adoration before the Triune Lord of Hosts. Both the prophet and the seraphim were, therefore, worshippers of the Holy Ghost and of the Son, at the very time and by the very acts in which they worshipped the Father, which proves that, as the three Persons received equal homage in a case which does not admit of the evasion of pretended superior and inferior worship, they are equal in majesty, glory, and essence.

4. "As in the tabernacle form of benediction, the Triune Jehovah is recognized as the source of all grace and peace to his creatures; so in apostolic formula of blessing, 'The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the COMMUNION ON THE HOLY SPIRIT, be with you all. Amen.' Here the personality of the three is kept distinct, and the *prayer* to the three is, that Christians may have a *common participation* of the Holy Spirit, that is, doubtless, as he was promised by

our Lord to his disciples, as a Comforter, as the source of light and spiritual life, as the author of regeneration. Thus the Spirit is acknowledged, equally with the Father and the Son, to be the source and the giver of the highest spiritual blessing, while this solemn *ministerial* benediction is, from its specific character, to be regarded as an act of *payer* to each of the three Persons, and therefore is, at once, an acknowledgement of the Divinity and Personality of each.

"The form of baptism next presents itself with demonstrative evidence on the two points before us, the Personality and Divinity of the Holy Spirit. It is the form of COVENANT by which the sacred Three become our ONE or ONLY GOD, and we become HIS people. 'Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in THE NAME of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST.' In what manner is this text to be disposed of, if the Personality of the Holy Ghost is denied? Is the form of baptism to be so understood as to imply that it is baptism in the name of one *God*, one *creature*, and *one attribute*? The grossness of this absurdity refutes it, and proves that here, at least, there can be no personification. If all the three, therefore, are persons, are we to make Christian baptism a baptism in the name of one God and two creatures? This would be too near an approach to idolatry, or rather, it would be idolatry itself; for, considering baptism as an act of dedication to God, the acceptance of God as our God, on our part, and the renunciation of all other deities, and all other religions, what could a Heathen convert conceive of the two *creatures* so distinguished from all other creatures in heaven and in earth, and so associated with God himself as to form together the *one name* to which, by that act, he was devoted, and which he was henceforward to profess and honor, but that they were equally Divine unless special care were taken to instruct him that but one of the three was God, and the two others but creatures? But of this care, of this

cautionary instruction; though so obviously necessary upon this theory, no single instance can be given in all the writings of the Apostles."—*Watson.*

6. The Holy Spirit is the Most High, and from revelation we learn, that the Most High is Jehovah, the incommunicable, self-existent, essence; or (what is exactly the same) that Jehovah *only* is the Most High. *Thou, whose name* ALONE *is* JEHOVAH, *art the* MOST HIGH *over all the earth;* or, (as others render it) *Thou, whose name is* JEHOVAH, *art* ALONE *the* MOST HIGH *over all the earth.* Psa. lxxxiii. 18. He is called Jehovah Most High, in Psa. vii. 18, and in other places: And, in Psa. xcii. 8, JEHOVAH *the* MOST HIGH *for evermore.* There can be no doubt, therefore, that this term can only be applied to God, and be reciprocated as a name of his infinite and exalted nature. If, then, it can be applied, and is applied to the Holy Spirit, it will prove most demonstrably, and ought to prove beyond all controversy, that he is truly God or Jehovah, or a *person* in the self-existent essence so named.

In Psalms lxxviii. 17—19, the Israelites are said to have provoked the Most High. "And they sinned yet more and more against him by provoking the Most High in the wilderness. And they tempted God in their heart by asking meat for their lust. Yea they speak against God; they said can God furnish a table in the wilderness?"

Now, the prophet *Isaiah* declares, that this provocation of the *Israelites* was against the Holy Spirit: *They rebelled and vexed his* Holy Spirit. Isa. lxiii. 10. The martyr *Stephen* says, *that they resisted the* Holy Ghost. Acts viii. 51. And the apostle to the *Hebrews* confirms both, by declaring, that it is *the* Holy Ghost, *who saith, your fathers tempted* ME, *proved* ME; *and saw* MY *works forty years.* Heb. iii. 7, 9.

The Holy Spirit, therefore, in these last texts, is the Most High, Jehovah, stated by the Psalmist in the pre-

ceding text, and consequently, the true, infinite, self-existent, and everlasting God.

It may be noted, by the way, that the above passage in the *Hebrews*, were there no other in the Bible to assert the essential divinity of the *Holy Spirit*, is sufficient of itself for that purpose; for it asserts, that all the *works*, which were done in the wilderness, before or in behalf of the *Israelites*, were the glorious operations of the Holy Ghost. They are also ascribed to *Christ* as one of the persons in the essence; and no one will deny, who believes in revelation at all, that God, or the Father, was undoubtedly present: It follows, then, that all was performed by the *Trinity* in *Unity*, and that the whole was carried on by the *power* and according to the *will* of the *three* divine persons in the *one* undivided essence. Take it in any other view, and there will be *different agents* of *different natures* in this work of salvation, and consequently *more* Gods than *one*; because to these different agents are the names of God ascribed: Or, there will be only *one agent* under *different names*, and so, consequently, *Christ* and the *Holy Ghost* with the *Father* are but *one person*, who suffered and bled, who *departed* yet came again as *another comforter*, yet *not another* but the same; and thus the Scriptures will be an heap of *contradictions*, as well as *blasphemies* against the divine nature. The adversaries, therefore, of the Christian doctrine of the *trinity*, who profess to receive the Bible, have only this refuge as adversaries; either to adopt *polytheism* and so become idolaters, or to plunge into the sink of *Sabellianism*, and so admit that the Father was crucified and suffered, putting a lie into Christ's mouth, when he declared *My God, my God, why hast thou* FORSAKEN *me*. A man must in fact reject the Scriptures altogether, as a divine revelation, if he deny the doctrine of a trinity, upon which, as upon one great and necessary foundation, they entirely stand.

Luke i. 25. *The* HOLY GHOST *shall come upon thee, and the power of the* HIGHEST *shall overshadow thee:*

therefore also that holy thing, which shall be born of thee, shall be called the SON OF GOD. In the 32d verse, this *Son of God* is called the *Son of the Highest*, and, therefore, *Christ*, as to his human nature, is the Son of the *Holy Ghost*, by whose operation that human nature was formed in the virgin's womb. Hence it appears, that *God*, *Highest*, and *Holy Ghost*, are terms of reciprocation, which could not be the case, unless the *Holy Ghost* were *God Most High*. But being *God Most High*, there is no blasphemy (as otherwise there certainly would be) in ascribing to him all the peculiar titles of the Godhead: Let those take care of *blasphemy against him* (Matt. xii. 31,) who are bold enough to ascribe them to any other.

John iii. 5. *Except a man* (says Christ) *be born of water and of the* SPIRIT, *he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.*

Luke vi. 35. But the same Christ tells his disciples, that *they shall be the children of the* HIGHEST, and (in Luke xx. 36,) *the children of God.*

The Spirit, therefore, is the Highest and God.

Upon the proof of this important point, there is an end of that controversy, which has employed so many tongues and pens, respecting the *proper object of worship*. A Unitarian, who dreams of his inferior deity, (as some of them do,) and all the endless absurdities which arise from that principle, may indeed be perplexed himself, and may perplex others, upon this point; but the orthodox Christian knows, that there is *one*, and *but one* object of worship, and that it is abominable idolatry to pay adoration to more. He also professes, that, as the three divine persons are only one essence, he cannot worship them as *separate* or *different* from that essence, and, consequently, that whether he address himself to *each* of the three persons, or to the *three* persons together, his prayer or praise ascends to the whole essence, which is an *undivided* ONE, and his worship is of "this Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity, in all things,"

and at all times. He is, therefore, a worshipper of *one* God, and indeed can worship no more, for there is but one.

7. The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of God. This is evident from those numerous passages of Scripture scattered through every part of the Bible in which he is so called; but if the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of God, then he must be God. To deny this is to assume, either that the Spirit of God is no more than an attribute, and, consequently, destitute of intelligence, an ignorant Holy Ghost, or that the Spirit of God is a created being, from which it would follow that there was a time when God had no Spirit; for if the Spirit was created, there must have been a time when it did not exist. Again, to talk of the Spirit of God, as a separate, inferior, and dependent being, is to assume, that God hath parts and divisions, and that, so far from having a simplicity of nature, he is a composition of superiority and inferiority, enduring a comparison with himself, which entirely takes away every idea of his perfection, infinitude and eternity. If the Spirit be separate from God, or is not God himself, then the title Spirit of God, so frequently given, is a dreadful mistake into which (it seems) God himself hath led us; and the being so called dwindles down at once into a mere minister of deity, an angel, or some other creature. It follows too, that something can be in the Godhead, which is not of the Godhead, and that God's Spirit, by which he made all things, may be like our breath and vanish into thin air. To such absurdity of blasphemy does some men's opinions necessarily lead them, if they are but extended to their natural length without any straining or perversion.

If likewise, the Spirit be inferior or dependent, he can neither be infinite nor eternal: which the Scriptures expressly declare. Heb. ix. 14. Or, if he be infinite and eternal, he will be equal to God himself, and, consequently, must either be God, which we believe; or there must be two Gods, two eternal and infinite beings,

which we deny, and which no man in his senses can maintain. The doctrine of two first principles is absurd in reason; and by religion we are told, that the Lord our God is but one Lord.

8. Another evidence of the Spirit's Divinity is that he is God, which will appear from the following passages of Scripture:

In Acts x. 19, 20, *The* Spirit *said to* Peter—*go*—I *have sent them.*

But, in verse 33, it is said, that they were *present before God, to hear all things that were commanded* him *of* God.

The Spirit, therefore, in one text, is called God in the other.

By comparing John i. 13, with James i. 18, and Gal. iv. 6; we find that true believers are called the children of God, and hence have a right to cry, Abba, Father.

But they are also said, necessarily and indispensably to be *born of the* SPIRIT, in John iii. 5, 8.

Consequently, the Spirit must be God: Or, God's children have two spiritual births, of two different spiritual beings, which is equally preposterous and unscriptural.

Luke i. 68, 70. Acts iii. 18, 21. *The Lord God of* Israel—*spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began.* See also Heb. i. 1. 2 Pet. i. 21. But, *holy men of God spake as they were moved by the* HOLY GHOST.

The Holy Ghost, therefore, is God, and the Lord God of *Israel.*—A multitude of other Scriptures may be found to confirm the major and minor part of this argument.

Justification of a sinner is and must be an act of Deity alone. It is expressly said, *it is* GOD *that justifieth:* And again, that HE [GOD] *justifieth the ungodly;* and that this God is ONE GOD, *who shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith.* Rom. iii. 30, iv. 5, viii. 33.

But divine truth assures us, that the Spirit also justifieth. 1 Cor. vi. 11. Ye are justified—*by the Spirit of our God.*

The Spirit, therefore, is God; and a *person*, necessarily, in the ONE GOD JEHOVAH.

Peter said to Ananias, *Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the* HOLY GHOST—*thou hast not lied unto men, but unto* GOD. Acts v. 3, 4. This Scripture contains a syllogism within itself. "Thou hast not lied unto men but unto God:" because thou hast lied to the Holy Ghost, who is God. They, who take this Scripture in any other way, only puzzle themselves to make the apostle speak nonsense. Crellius, and others, have attempted to torture this text to confess a contradiction of itself; namely, that Ananias, in lying to the Holy Ghost, did NOT *lie to* GOD, but only to his messenger, an emanation, a virtue, a power, a quiddity. An absurdity not more unphilosophical, than unscriptural and unworthy of his high titles and character! But, if the Holy Ghost be not true and very God, where is the particular horror and aggravation of Ananias' crime. A crime which, if committed only against a *creature*, is also committed against the creatures every day.

This Holy Spirit has dominion and power in the souls of men; and, therefore, the grace of *faith* is styled one of his *fruits*, effects or operations. Gal. v. 22.

But this very *faith* is, by the same apostle, said to be *of the operation of God.* Col. ii. 12.

What, therefore, is the Spirit, but God?

From the same possession of power, *the* SPIRIT *helpeth our infirmities; for we know not what we should pray for as we ought, &c.* Rom. viii. 26.

But in Phil. ii. 13, the apostle says, *it is* GOD *which worketh* IN YOU *both to* WILL *and to* DO *of his good pleasure.*

Consequently the Spirit is God.

Upon the same principle is this argument: Believers

are *sealed by the* SPIRIT *to the day of redemption.* Eph. iv. 30.

But the same apostle, speaking in behalf of believers, says, that *God hath sealed us.* 2 Cor. i. 22.

Therefore, the Spirit is God.

Another operation of the Spirit is his witness in the soul by his heavenly grace. Heb. x. 15. *The* HOLY GHOST *is a witness to us.* John v. 6. *It is the* SPIRIT *that beareth witness, because the* SPIRIT *is* TRUTH.

But, in verse the 9th of the last mentioned chapter, this witness is called *the witness of* GOD, *which he hath testified of his Son.*

Therefore, the witness of the Spirit, and the witness of God, are *one;* because God and the Spirit are *one.*

God is an unsearchable being to his creatures; because he is infinite, and they are finite altogether. There can be no *measure* without degrees of *comparison:* And the divine nature must transcend all degrees, which infer *more* or *less;* for there cannot be *more* or *less,* or any expression of *quantity,* in a being both unlimited and incomprehensible. Hence, it is said, HIS *greatness* (or vastness) *is unsearchable.* Psa. cxlv. 3.

But the Spirit searcheth all Things, yea the deep things [the profound fullness] of God. 1 Cor. ii. 10.

Can any words, therefore, more strongly argue, that the Spirit is equal with God? And if equal, then necessarily *God himself.*

The Holy Spirit is promised to remain with the church in all ages of the world. There is no true *ministry* in it but by his ordination; and no *success* from that ministry but by his operation. Hence the Holy Ghost is said to make *overseers to feed* the flock. Acts xx. 28.

But, in 1 Cor. xii. 28, we read that it is God, who *hath set in the church* the various orders of ministers.

And, therefore, it obviously concludes, that the Holy Ghost is God.

It is repeatedly said, that God *raised Christ from the dead.* Acts ii. 24, *et al.* Very remarkable in Heb.

xiii. 20, 21. *The* GOD *of* PEACE, *that brought again from the dead our* LORD JESUS, *that great Shepherd of the sheep, make you perfect in every good work,* WORKING IN YOU *that which is well pleasing, &c.*

But it is also said that Christ was *quickened by the* SPIRIT. 1 Pet. iii. 18. And the text in the Hebrews evidently relates to the office-character of the Holy Ghost.

It will follow, then, that the Spirit is God and *the God of Peace.*

The Israelites *provoked the* LORD GOD *in the wilderness, proved him, and saw his work.* Comp. Psa. xcv. 8, 9, with Exod. xvii. 7, Numb. xiv. 22, *et al.*

But *the Holy Ghost saith—your fathers tempted* ME, &c. Heb. iii. 7, &c.

The Holy Ghost, therefore, is Lord God.

No creature can possibly be an object of *worship*; and therefore no creature can possibly have a *temple* for the worship of itself. The pretence would be impious, and the service idolatrous.

But believers are called in several places, *the temples of the Holy Ghost*, and *the temples of God*, indiscriminately. There is not the least difference or distinction, or even the remotest hint of a difference or distinction made between them. 1 Cor. iii. 16, 2 Cor. vi. 16, &c.

God and the Holy Ghost, therefore, are essentially one as well as their temples; and thus, distinctly in *person*, or *conjunctively* in *essence*, are the proper *object of worship* and adoration.

There would be no end to the arguments which might be brought to prove this truth of the Spirit's divinity from his own Bible. Indeed, as *the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy*, so the testimony of the Holy Spirit is the power and principle of all revelation, and consequently, as such, the very life of all the Scriptures. Without *Him*, they never would have existed; nor, without his continual *agency*, are they, more than any other book, a blessing in the world.

It appears, then, from revelation, that the Holy Spirit is *Lord* and *God;* that he is a divine *Person*, and not a mere unconscious instrument, or created quality; and that, accordingly, He has ascriptions which can belong only to a person in the *Godhead* who sees, who knows, and who orders all things. We will conclude this point of the *Spirit's* proper divinity by an argument of a mixed nature, founded indeed, as to its *datum*, upon divine *revelation*, like all other spiritual truth: but more combined with human reason, which some people pretend to exalt against the wisdom of God, but which "purged from its film," becomes its dutiful servant and willing advocate against the daring pretences of unreasonable men.

God alone is the Creator of all things. This is a maxim which revelation has fully declared, and to which the lowest degree of reason must yield a ready assent. All the men, who have ever lived upon the earth, were never able to produce a *new* thing upon it, or to give *life* where it has once been taken away. The intellect of man can only rise to a discovery, more or less, of what exists; and all his power is exercised only upon the matter and forms about him, to which he can *add* nothing of his own, nor from which *diminish* aught by a reduction to nothing. This rule must hold with all ranks of being, except the Supreme. But we are informed, by the unerring wisdom of the Most High, that the Spirit, of whom we are treating, has made, has fashioned, does give life and being to the *heavens*, to the *earth*, and to *men*. This Spirit, therefore, is not, cannot be *made* himself: And if he be *not* a creature, he must be of the *same substance* with the *Godhead* of the *Father*, and the *Son;* and, being of the same substance, has a right to the title of *Creator*, with them in the *unity* of that substance. Now, as whatever is not God, must necessarily be a creature; so whatever is not a creature, that must be God. If the Spirit, therefore, be not of the same substance with the Godhead, he is unavoid-

ably a *created substance:* And if He be a created substance, then nothing ever was, or ever could be created *by Him.* But the word of the living God says positively, that the *heavens*, and the *earth*, and *man* in particular, *were created* by him: And, therefore, it will follow, upon the united assent of revelation and reason, that the *Holy Spirit* as *Creator*, is of one substance or essence with the *Father* and the *Son*, and consequently is with them, *God over all, blessed for ever.*

Could it be admitted for a moment, that the Holy Ghost is *not* very God, nor a proper object of worship; then the Christian church *in all ages* has been guilty of the most profane and abominable idolatry, and the hosts of heaven sing, *Holy, Holy, Holy*, for nought; and (with horror be it spoken) God himself has failed in the performance of his promise, that his people should be *led and guided into* ALL Truth, and that against his *church the gates of hell should never prevail.* But, if it be impossible, that God should have so left his church, or that his faithfulness and truth should thus have failed; it will follow, that the Holy Spirit has been rightly the object of their constant adoration, and that He himself has inspired them with his grace to render to him this tribute of their praise.

"As a DIVINE PERSON, our regards are, therefore, justly due to him as the object of worship and trust, of prayer and blessing; duties to which we are specially called, both by the general consideration of his Divinity, and by that affectingly benevolent and attractive character under which he is presented to us in the whole Scriptures. In creation we see him moving upon the face of chaos, and reducing it to a beautiful order; in providence, 'renewing the face of the earth,' 'garnishing the heavens,' and 'giving life' to man. In grace we behold him expanding the prophetic scene to the vision of the seers of the Old Testament, and making a perfect revelation of the doctrine of Christ to the Apostles of the New. He 'reproves the world of sin,'

and works secret conviction of its evil and danger in the heart. He is 'the Spirit of grace and supplication;' the softened heart, the yielding will, all heavenly desires and tendencies are from him. He hastens to the troubled spirits of penitent men, who are led by his influence to Christ, and in whose hearts he has wrought *faith*, with the news of pardon, and 'bears witness' of their sonship 'with their spirit.' He aids their 'infirmities;' makes 'intercession for them;' inspires thoughts of consolation and feelings of peace; plants and perfects in them whatsoever things are pure, and lovely, and honest, and of good report; delights in his own work in the renewed heart; dwells in the soul as in a temple; and, after having rendered the spirit to God, without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, sanctified and meet for heaven, finishes his benevolent and glorious work by raising the bodies of saints in immortal life at the last day. So powerfully does 'the Spirit of glory and of God' claim our love, our praise, and our obedience! In the forms of the churches of Christ, in all ages, he has, therefore, been associated with the Father and the Son, in equal glory and blessing; and where such forms are not in use, this distinct recognition of the Spirit, so much in danger of being neglected, ought, by ministers, to be most carefully and constantly made, in every gratulatory act of devotion, that so equally to each Person of the Eternal Trinity glory may be given 'in the church throughout all ages. Amen.'"

CHAPTER IV.

ON THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST.

Having in the preceding argument established the Personality and Divinity of the Holy Spirit, we shall endeavor in this to prove the Supreme Divinity of Je-

sus Christ; and if we succeed in this, then it will necessarily follow either that the doctrine of the Trinity is true or that there is a plurality of Gods, which is contrary to the whole tenor of Scripture; for it is most expressly declared that there is but one God. On this point, the testimony of Scripture is express and unequivocal, "The Lord our God is *one* Lord," Deut. vi. 4, "The Lord he is God, there is none else besides him," Deut. iv. 35, "Thou art God *alone*," Psalms lxxxvi. 10, "We know that an idol is nothing in the world, and there is none other God but *one*," 1 Cor. viii. 4, "I am the Lord, there is none else, there is no God besides me," Isah. xlv. 5, "And thou shalt know no God but me: for there is no Saviour besides me," Hosea xiii. 4, "Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord," Mark xii. 29, "Thus saith the Lord the king of Israel, and his Redeemer the Lord of hosts, I am the first, and I am the last, and besides me there is no God," Isah. xliv. 6. These declarations of sacred writers establish the position that there is but one God beyond the possibility of contradiction. This point we wish the reader distinctly to bear in mind: for it is the foundation and the key stone to the whole fabric of scriptural theology; and every argument in favor of the Trinity flows from this principle of absolute unity in God—a principle which Unitarians fancy to be inconsistent with the orthodox doctrine.

With this important point, that there is but one God, fixed in our minds, we shall now pass to examine the various arguments which will be brought forward to prove the essential Divinity of Christ.

The first argument which we shall advance in support of this important point, will be founded upon his pre-existence. And,

1. The pre-existence of our Saviour is clearly exhibited in the testimony of John the Baptist. John i. 15, "He that cometh after me is preferred before me, for *he was before me*;" or, as it is in the 30th verse, "After

me cometh a man which is preferred before me, for he was before me." Now if he was before John the Baptist, as these passages plainly show, he must have *existed* before him. And if he existed before him, it is evident that he existed before his incarnation: for the birth of John was prior to that of Jesus Christ.

2. He came down from heaven; consequently must have existed in heaven before his incarnation. St. John iii. 13, "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the son of man which is in heaven." He also styles himself "the bread of life which came down from heaven."

3. He came from God. John xiii. 3, "Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God, and went to God." But if he come from God, he must have existed with him before he came from him, and therefore must have had an existence before his advent into this world.

4. "He was made flesh," John i. 14. "As the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same." "For verily, he took not on him the nature of Angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham," Heb. xi. 14, 16. These expressions plainly involve the idea of the pre-existence of Christ, who was made flesh, or, as the Apostle expresses it, "who took upon himself flesh and blood."

5. When Jesus Christ came into the world, he came voluntarily. "When he cometh into the world, he saith sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared for me; Lo, I come to do thy will, O God," Heb. x. 5, 7. But if he came into the world, and took upon him a body, he must have existed before he came and *took* his body.

6. He existed before Abraham. John viii. 5, "Before Abraham was I am." The obvious sense of this passage is, as Mr. Watson remarks, "Before Abraham was, or was born, I was in existence." Abraham, the patriarch, was the person spoken of: for the Jews hav-

ing said, "Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham our Lord," declares, with his peculiarly solemn mode of introduction, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was I am." I had priority of existence, together with a continuation of it to the end of time. Nor did the Jews mistake his meaning; but being filled with indignation at so manifest a claim of Divinity, "they took up stones to stone him." We must therefore conclude that our Saviour existed not only before John the Baptist, but also before the patriarch Abraham; and consequently, that he did exist at least two thousand years before he was born.

7. He created all things. John i. 3, "All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made." Again: Col. i. 15, 16, 17, "Who is the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature: for by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities or powers: all things were created by him and for him, and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." But if he was before all things, and if all things were created by him, it is evident that he did exist *before* the creation, consequently before his incarnation, which did not take place until four thousand years *after* the creation.

8. The last passage which I shall quote, may properly, both from its dignity and explicitness, close the whole. John xvii. 5, "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine ownself, *with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.*" On this passage, Mr. Watson very appropriately remarks, "Whatever this glory was, it was possessed by Christ before the world was, or as he afterwards expressed it, before the foundation of the world. That question is therefore not to be confounded with the main point which determines the pre-existence of our Lord: for if he was with the Father, and had a glory with him before the world was,

and of which he emptied himself when he became man, then he had an existence, not only before his incarnation, but before the very foundation of the world." So conclusive is this passage in proving the pre-existence of Christ, that as Dr. Harwood says, "Were there no other intimation in the whole New Testament of the pre-existence of Christ, this single passage would irrefragibly demonstrate and establish it. Our Saviour, here in a solemn act of devotion, declares to the Almighty that he had a glory with him before the world was, and fervently supplicates that he would be graciously pleased to reinstate him in his former felicity. The language is plain and clear. Every word has great moment and emphasis:—*Glorify thou me with that glory which I enjoyed in thy presence before the world was.* Upon this single text I lay my finger. Here I posit my system. And if plain words be designedly employed to convey any determinate meaning; if the modes of human speech have any precision, I am convinced, that this plain declaration of our Lord, in an act of devotion, exhibits a great and important truth, which can never be subverted or invalidated by any accurate and satisfactory evidence."

Having, therefore, proven, in opposition to the Socinian hypothesis, from the plainest possible testimony; testimony which no criticism, and no unlicensed comment, has been able to shake or obscure, that our Saviour had an existence before his incarnation, and even before the "foundation of the world," in conclusion we would remark, that if Jesus Christ did exist previous to his incarnation, if he possessed *any* nature before his advent into this world, it must have been either a human angelic or Divine nature. That it was not a human nature, is evident from the fact that no one can believe in the pre-existence of human souls. That it was not an angelic nature, is also clear from Heb. ii. 16, "For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham." Also, from Heb.

i. 4, 5, "Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath obtained a more excellent name than they. For unto which of the angels said he at any time thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee?" If, then, he had a more excellent name, and was made better than any of the angels, and if he took not upon him their nature, it is clear that he was not one of them; and if, in his pre-existent state, he possessed neither a human nor angelic nature, it is evident that he must have been a DIVINE BEING.

II. Christ is the Jehovah of the Old Testament, the God worshiped by the Jews, Jer. iii. 31, 32. "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new Covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah; not according to the Covenant that *I made* with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt." The Jehovah who led the Israelites out of Egypt and gave them their law, is here plainly introduced as the author of the new Covenant. This new Covenant, according to the argument of the Apostle Paul in the 8th chapter of Hebrews, is the Gospel dispensation, of which Christ is evidently the author; consequently he must be the Jehovah of the Old Testament, the God of the Jewish people, who led them out of the land of Egypt, and gave them their law, amid the most awful displays of Divine Majesty on the trembling summit of Sinai, where, as well as in after ages, he received the worship of the children of Israel; for, according to the above passage, the same person is author of both the Old and New Covenant.

The same doctrine is taught, with equal clearness, in that celebrated prediction recorded in Malachi iii. 1.

"Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare my way before me; and the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in; behold he shall come, saith the Lord of Hosts."

"The characters under which the person who is the subject of this prophecy is described, are, the Lord, a sovereign ruler, the owner of the temple, and therefore a Divine prince or governor, he 'shall come to *his temple*.' 'The temple,' says Bishop Horsley, 'in the writings of a Jewish prophet, cannot be otherwise understood, according to the literal meaning, than of the temple at Jerusalem. Of this temple, therefore, the person to come is expressly called the Lord. The lord of any temple, in the language of all writers, and in the natural meaning of the phrase, is the divinity to whose worship it is consecrated. To no other divinity was the temple of Jerusalem consecrated, than the true and everlasting God, the Lord Jehovah, the Maker of heaven and earth. Here, then, we have the express testimony of Malachi, that the Christ, the Deliverer, whose coming he announces, was no other than the Jehovah of the Old Testament. Jehovah had delivered the Israelites from the Egyptian bondage; and the same Jehovah was to come in person to his temple, to effect the greater and more general deliverance of which the former was but an imperfect type.'

"Now, this prophecy is expressly applied to Christ by St. Mark. 'The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, *as it is written*, Behold I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee.' It follows from this, that Jesus is the Lord, the Lord of the Temple, the Messenger of the Covenant mentioned in the prophecy; and bearing these exact characters of the Jehovah of the Old Testament, who was the *King* of the Jews; whose temple was HIS, because he resided in it, and so was called 'the house of the Lord;' and who was 'the *Messenger' of the Covenant;* the identity of the person cannot be mistaken. One coincidence is singularly striking. Jehovah had his residence in the Jewish tabernacle and temple, and took possession, or came suddenly to both, at their dedication, and filled them with his glory. On one occasion,

Jesus himself, though in a state of humiliation, comes in public procession to the temple at Jerusalem, and calls it 'his own;' thus at once declaring that he was the ancient and rightful Lord of the Temple, and appropriating to himself this eminent prophecy. Bishop Horsley has introduced this circumstance in his usual striking and convincing manner.

"'A third time Jesus came still more remarkably as the Lord to *his* temple, when he came up from Galilee to celebrate the last passover, and made that public entry at Jerusalem which is described by all the Evangelists. It will be necessary to enlarge upon the particulars of this interesting story: for the right understanding of our Saviour's conduct upon this occasion depends so much upon seeing certain leading circumstances in a proper light,—upon a recollection of ancient prophecies, and an attention to the customs of the Jewish people,—that I am apt to suspect, few now-a-days discern in this extraordinary transaction what was clearly seen in it at the time by our Lord's disciples, and in some measure understood by his enemies. I shall present you with an orderly detail of the story, and comment upon the particulars as they arise: and I doubt not but that by God's assistance I shall teach you to perceive in this public entry of Jesus of Nazareth, (if you have not perceived it before,) a conspicuous advent of the great Jehovah into his temple. Jesus, on his last journey from Galilee to Jerusalem, stops at the foot of Mount Olivet, and sends two of his disciples to a neighboring village to provide an ass's colt to convey him from that place to the city, distant not more than half a mile. The colt is brought, and Jesus is seated upon it. This first circumstance must be well considered; it is the key to the whole mystery of the story. What could be his meaning in choosing this singular conveyance? It could not be that the fatigue of the short journey which remained was likely to be too much for him on foot; and that no better animal was to be procu-

red. Nor was the ass in these days (though it had been in earlier ages) an animal in high esteem in the East, used for traveling or for state by persons of the first condition,—that this conveyance should be chosen for the grandeur or propriety of the appearance. Strange as it may seem, the coming to Jerusalem upon an ass's colt was one of the prophetical characters of the Messiah; and the great singularity of it had perhaps been the reason that this character had been more generally attended to than any other; so that there was no Jew who was not apprised that the Messiah was to come to the holy city in that manner. 'Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion! shout, O daughter of Jerusalem!' saith Zechariah; 'Behold thy King cometh unto thee! He is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, even a colt, the foal of an ass!' And this prophecy the Jews never understood of any other person than the Messiah. Jesus, therefore, by seating himself upon the ass's colt in order to go to Jerusalem, without any possible inducement either of grandeur or convenience, openly declared himself to be that King who was to come, and at whose coming in that manner Zion was to rejoice. And so the disciples, if we may judge from what immediately followed, understood this proceeding; for no sooner did they see their master seated on the colt, than they broke out into transports of the highest joy, as if in this great sight they had the full contentment of their utmost wishes; conceiving, as it should seem, the sanguine hope that the kingdom was this instant to be restored to Israel. They strewed the way which Jesus was to pass with the green branches of the trees which grew beside it; a mark of honor, in the East, never paid but to the greatest emperors on occasions of the highest pomp. They proclaimed him the long expected heir of David's throne,—the Blessed One coming in the name of the Lord; that is, in the language of Malachi, the Messenger of the Covenant: and they rent the skies with the exulting acclamation

of 'Hosanna in the highest!' On their way to Jerusalem, they are met by a great multitude from the city, whom the tidings had no sooner reached than they ran out in eager joy to join his triumph. When they reached Jerusalem, 'the whole city,' says the blessed Evangelist, 'was moved.' Here recollect, that it was now the season of the passover. The passover was the highest festival of the Jewish nation, the anniversary of that memorable night when Jehovah led his armies out of Egypt with a high hand and an extended arm,—'a night much to be remembered to the Lord of the children of Israel in their generations;' and much indeed it was remembered. The devout Jews flocked at this season to Jerusalem, not only from every corner of Judea, but from the remotest countries whither God had scattered them; and the numbers of the strangers that were annually collected in Jerusalem during this festival are beyond imagination. These strangers, who living at a distance knew little of what had been passing in Judea since their last visit, were they who were moved (as well they might be) with wonder and astonishment, when Jesus, so humble in his equipage, so honored in his numerous attendants, appeared within the city gates; and every one asks his neighbor, 'Who is this?' It was replied by some of the natives of Judea,—but, as I conceive, by none of the disciples; for any of them at this time would have given another answer,—it was replied, 'This is the Nazarene, the great prophet from Galilee.' Through the throng of these astonished spectators the procession passed by the public streets of Jerusalem to the temple, where immediately the sacred porticoes resound with the continued hosannas of the multitudes. The chief priests and scribes are astonished and alarmed: they request Jesus himself to silence his followers. Jesus, in the early part of his ministry, had always been cautious of any public display of personal consequence; lest the malice of his enemies should be too soon provoked, or the unadvised zeal of his friends

should raise civil commotions. But now that his work on earth was finished in all but the last painful part of it,—now that he had firmly laid the foundations of God's kingdom in the hearts of his disciples,—now that the Apostles were prepared and instructed for their office,—now that the days of vengeance on the Jewish nation were at hand, and it mattered not how soon they should incur the displeasure of the Romans their masters,—Jesus lays aside a reserve which could be no longer useful; and, instead of checking the zeal of his followers, he gives a new alarm to the chief priests and scribes, by a direct and firm assertion of his right to the honors that were so largely shown to him. 'If these,' says he, 'were silent, the stones of this building would be endued with a voice to proclaim my titles:' and then, as on a former occasion, he drove out the traders; but with a higher tone of authority, calling it his own house, and saying, '*My* house is the house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of thieves.' You have now the story, in all its circumstances, faithfully collected from the four Evangelists; nothing exaggerated, but set in order, and perhaps somewhat illustrated by an application of old prophecies, and recollection of Jewish customs. Judge for yourselves whether this was not an advent of the Lord Jehovah taking personal possession of his temple.'"

The next passage to which we shall call the attention of the reader, in order to prove that Jesus Christ is the Jehovah of the Old Testament, is Isaiah xl. 3.

"'The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, (JEHOVAH,) make straight in the desert a highway for our God. Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain shall be made low; and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain, and the glory of the Lord (JEHOVAH) shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together.' This being spoken of him of whom John the Baptist was to be the forerunner; and the application

having been afterward expressly made by the Baptist to our Lord, it is evident that HE is the person 'to whom the prophet attributes the incommunicable name of JEHOVAH, and styles him 'our God.'"

"There are, however, a few passages which, in a still more distinct manner than any which have been introduced, except that from the prophecy of Jeremiah, identify Jesus Christ with the Jehovah in the Patriarchal and Levitical dispensations; and a brief consideration of them will leave this important point completely established.

"Let it then be recollected, that he who dwelt in the Jewish tabernacle, between the Cherubims, was *Jehovah.* In Psalm lxviii, which was written on the removal of the ark to Mount Zion, he is expressly addressed. 'This is the hill which God desireth to dwell in;' and again, 'They have seen thy goings, O God, my King, in thy sanctuary.' But the Apostle Paul, Eph. iv. 8, applies this Psalm to Christ, and considers this very *ascent* of Jehovah to Mount Zion as a prophetic type of the ascent of Jesus to the celestial Zion. '*Wherefore* he saith, when he ascended on high he led captivity captive,' &c. The conclusion, therefore, is, that the Jehovah who is addressed in the Psalm, and Christ, are the same person. This is marked with equal strength in verse 29. The Psalm, let it be observed, is determined by apostolical authority to be a prophecy of Christ, as indeed its terms intimate; and with reference to the future conquests of Messiah, the prophet exclaims, 'Because of *thy temple* at Jerusalem shall kings bring presents unto thee.' The future Christ is spoken of as one having *then* a temple at Jerusalem.

"It was the glory of Jehovah the resident God of the Temple, which Isaiah saw in the vision recorded in the 6th chapter of his prophecy; but the Evangelist John expressly declares, that on that occasion the prophet saw the glory of Christ and spake of him. John

xii. 37—41. Christ therefore was the Lord of Hosts whose glory filled the Temple.

"St. Peter calls the Spirit of Jehovah, by which the prophets 'prophesied of the grace that should come, the Spirit of *Christ*.' He also informs us that 'Christ was put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit, by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which some time were disobedient when once the long suffering of God waited *in the days of Noah*, while the ark was preparing.' Now, whatever may be the full meaning of this difficult passage, Christ is clearly represented as preaching by his Spirit in the days of Noah; that is, inspiring Noah to preach. Let this be collated with the declaration of Jehovah before the flood, '*My Spirit* shall not always strive with man, for that he is flesh, yet his days shall be a hundred and twenty years,' during which period of delay and long-suffering, Noah was made by him, from whom alone inspiration can come, a preacher of righteousness; and it is clear, that Christ and the Jehovah of the antediluvian world, are supposed by St. Peter to have been the same person. In the 11th chapter of the Hebrews, Moses is said to have esteemed the *reproach of Christ*, greater riches than the treasures of Egypt; a passage of easy interpretation, when it is admitted that the Jehovah of the Israelites, whose name and worship Moses professed, and Christ, were the same person. For this worship he was reproached by the Egyptians, who preferred their own idolatry, and treated, as all apostates do, the true religion, the pure worship of former ages from which they had departed, with contempt. To be reproached for the sake of Jehovah, and to be reproached for Christ, were convertible phrases with the Apostle, because he considered Jehovah and Christ to be the same person.

"'In St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, we read, 'Neither let us tempt CHRIST, as some of them (that is, the Jews in the wilderness) also tempted, and were destroyed by serpents,' x. 9. The pronoun *him*

must be understood after 'tempted,' and it is found in some MSS., though not sufficiently numerous to warrant its insertion in the text. It is, however, *necessarily* implied, and refers to Christ just before mentioned. The Jews in the wilderness here are said to have tempted some person; and to understand by that person any other than Christ, who is just before named, is against all grammar, which never allows without absolute necessity any other accusative to be understood by the verb than that of some person or thing before mentioned in the same sentence. The conjunction *also* establishes this interpretation beyond doubt: 'Neither let us tempt CHRIST as some of them ALSO tempted'—tempted whom? The answer clearly is, as they also tempted *Christ*. If Christ then was the person whom the Israelites tempted in the wilderness, he unavoidably becomes the Jehovah of the Old Testament.'

"This is rendered the more striking, when the passage to which the Apostle refers is given at length. 'Ye shall not tempt the *Lord your God*, as ye tempted him in Massah.' Now what could lead the Apostle to substitute *Christ*, in the place of the Lord your God? 'Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them *also* tempted' *Christ*, for that is the accusative which must be supplied. Nothing certainly but that the idea was familiar to him, that Christ, and the Jehovah, who conducted and governed the Israelites, were the same person.

"These views are confirmed by the testimonies of the early Fathers, to whom the opinions of the Apostles, on this subject, would naturally descend.

"Justin Martyr has delivered his sentiments very freely upon the Divine appearances. '*Our Christ*,' he says, 'conversed with Moses out of the bush, in the appearance of fire. And Moses received great strength from Christ, who spake to him in the appearance of fire.' Again:—'He formerly appeared in the form of fire, and without a human shape, to Moses and the oth-

er prophets: but now—being made a man of the Virgin,' &c.

"Irenæus says, 'The Scripture is full of the Son of God's appearing: sometimes to talk and eat with Abraham, at other times to instruct Noah about the measures of the ark; at another time to seek Adam; at another time to bring down judgment upon Sodom; then again, to direct Jacob in the way; and again to converse with Moses out of the bush.'

"Tertullian says, 'It was *the Son* who judged men from the beginning, destroying that lofty tower, and confounding their languages, punishing the whole world with a flood of waters, and raining fire and brimstone upon Sodom and Gomorrah, *the Lord* pouring it down *from the Lord:* for he always descended to hold converse with men, from Adam even to the patriarchs and prophets, in visions, in dreams, in mirrors, in dark sentences, always preparing his way from the beginning: neither was it possible, that the God who conversed with men upon earth, could be any other than *that Word* which was to be made flesh.'

"Clemens Alexandrinus says, 'Christ gave the world the law of nature, and the written law of Moses.'

"Origen says, 'My Lord Jesus Christ descended to the earth more than once. He came down to Esaias, to Moses, and to every one of the prophets.' Again: 'That our blessed Saviour did sometimes become as an angel, we may be induced to believe, if we consider the appearances and speeches of angels, who in some texts have said, 'I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac,'' &c."

We think we have now proved, to the satisfaction of every unprejudiced person, both from the Scriptures of Divine truth and from the opinions of the early Christian writers; writers who lived before the council of Nice, at which time Unitarians contend the doctrine of the Trinity had its origin, that Jesus Christ is the Jehovah of the Old Testament, who claimed and received

the worship of the Jewish nation, from which it must follow either that he is the eternal self-existent first cause of all things, or that the Jewish as well as the Christian Church have always worshipped a creature instead of the Creator, and that the Supreme governor of the universe has never yet revealed himself to the children of men.

III. The titles of Christ prove his Divinity, for they are such as can designate a Divine Being, and a Divine Being only. Consequently, our Saviour, to whom these titles are by inspired authority ascribed, must be Divine, or otherwise the word of TRUTH must stand charged with practising a direct deception upon mankind, and that in a fundamental article of religion. This is our argument, and we proceed to the illustration.

The first of these titles which calls for our attention is that of Jehovah. So many instances of this being applied to Christ were given in the preceding argument that it is unnecessary to repeat them; and indeed the fact, that the name Jehovah is applied to the Messiah in many passages of the Old Testament, is admitted by the manner in which the argument, deduced from this fact, is objected to by our opponents. "The Jewish Cabbalists," says Dr. Priestly, "might easily admit that the Messiah might be called Jehovah, without supposing that he was any thing more than a man, who had no existence before his birth."—"Several things in the Scriptures are called by the name of Jehovah; as, Jerusalem is called Jehovah our Righteousness." They are not, however, the Jewish interpreters only who give the name Jehovah to Messiah; but the inspired Prophets themselves, in passages which, by the equally inspired Evangelists and Apostles, are applied to Jesus. No instance can be given in which any being, acknowledged by all to be a created being, is called Jehovah in the Scriptures, or was so called among the Jews. The peculiar sacredness attached to this name among them was a sufficient guard against such an application of it

in their common language; and as for the Scriptures, they explicitly represent it as peculiar to Divinity itself. "*I am* JEHOVAH, *that is my name, and my glory will I not give to another.*" "*I am* JEHOVAH, *and there is none else, there is no God besides me.*" "*Thou, whose* NAME ALONE *is* JEHOVAH, *art the most high, above all the earth.*" The *peculiarity* of the name is often strongly stated by Jewish commentators, which sufficiently refutes Dr. Priestley, who affirms that they could not, on that account, conclude the Messiah to be more than a man. *Kimschi* paraphrases Isaiah xliii. 8: "JEHOVAH, that is my name"—"*that name is proper to me.*" On Hosea xii. 5: "JEHOVAH his memorial," he says, "In the name El and Elohim, he communicates with others; but, in this name, he communicates with none." Aben Ezra, on Exodus iii. 14, proves, at length, that this name is proper to God.

It is, surely, a miserable pretence to allege, that this name is sometimes given to *places*. It is so; but only in comparison with some other word, and not, surely, as indicative of any quality in the places themselves, but as MEMORIALS of the acts and goodness of JEHOVAH himself, as manifested in those localities. So "Jehovah-Jireh, in the mount of the Lord it shall be seen," or, "the Lord will see or provide," referred to HIS interposition to save Isaac, and, probably, to the *provision* of the future sacrifice of Christ. The same observation may be made as to *Jehovah Nissi*, *Jehovah Shallum*, &c.: they are names not descriptive of *places*, but of *events* connected with them, which marked the interposition and character of God himself.

Nor is it true, that, in Jeremiah xxxiii. 16, Jerusalem is called "Jehovah our Righteousness." The parallel passage in the same book, chap. xxiii. 5, 6, sufficiently shows that this is not the name of *Jerusalem*, but the name of "THE BRANCH." Much criticism has been bestowed upon these passages to establish the point, whether the clause ought to be rendered, "And this is the name by

which the Lord shall call him, *our* Righteousness;" or, "this is the name by which he shall be called, *the Lord our Righteousness;*" which last has, I think, been decisively established; but he would be a very exceptionable critic who should conclude either of them to be an appellative, not of Messiah, but of Jerusalem, contrary both to the scope of the passage and the literal rendering of the words, words capable of somewhat different constructions, but in no case capable of being applied either to the people of Judah, or to the city of Jerusalem.

The force of the argument from the application of the name of Jehovah to Messiah may be thus stated:

Whatever belongs to Messiah, that may and must be attributed to Jesus, as being the true and only Christ; and accordingly we have seen, that the Evangelists and Apostles apply those passages to our Lord, in which the Messiah is unequivocally called *Jehovah.* But this is the peculiar and appropriate name of God; that name by which he is distinguished from all other beings, and which imports perfections so high and appropriate to the only living and true God, such as self-existence and eternity, that it can, in truth, be a descriptive appellation of no other being. It is, however, *solemnly and repeatedly given to the Messiah;* and, unless we can suppose Scripture to contradict itself, by making that a peculiar name which is not peculiar to him, and to establish an inducement to that idolatry which it so sternly condemns, and an excuse for it, then this adorable name itself declares the absolute Divinity of him who is invested with it, and is to him, as well as to the Father, a *name of revelation,* a name descriptive of the attributes which can pertain only to essential Godhead.

2. This conclusion is corroborated by the constant use of the title "LORD" as an appellation of *Jesus,* the Messiah, when manifest in the flesh. His disciples not only applied to him those passages of the Old Testament, in which the Messiah is called Jehovah, but

salute and worship him by a title which is of precisely the same original import, and which is, therefore, to be considered in many places of the Septuagint and the New Testament, an exact translation of the august name Jehovah, and fully equivalent to it in its import. It is allowed, that it is also used as the translation of other names of God, which import simply dominion, and that it is applied also to merely human masters and rulers. It is not, therefore, like the Jehovah of the Old Testament, an *incommunicable* name, but, in *its highest sense*, it is universally allowed to belong to God; and, if, in this *highest sense*, it is applied to Christ, then is the argument valid, that in the sacred writers, whether used to express the self and independent existence of him who bears it, or that dominion which, from it nature and circumstances, must be Divine, it contains a notion of true and absolute Divinity.

The first proof of this is, that, both in the Septuagint and by the writers of the New Testament, it is the term by which the name Jehovah is translated, and, in all passages in which Messias is called by that peculiar title of Divinity, we have this authority to apply it, in its full and highest signification, to Jesus Christ, who is himself that Messias. For this reason, and also because, as men inspired, they were directed to fit and proper terms, the writers of the New Testament apply this appellation to their Master, when they quote these prophetic passages as fulfilled in him. They found it used in the Greek version of the Old Testament, in its *highest possible import*, as a rendering of Jehovah. Had they thought Jesus less than God, they ought to have avoided, and must have avoided, giving to him a title which would mislead their readers; or else have intimated, that they did not use it in its highest sense as a title of Divinity, but in its very lowest, as a term of merely human courtesy, or, at best, of human dominion. But we have no such intimation; and, if they wrote under the inspiration of the Spirit of Truth, it follows, that they

used it as being understood to be fully equivalent to the title *Jehovah* itself. This their quotations will show. The evangelist Matthew (iii. 3) quotes and applies to Christ the celebrated prophecy of Isaiah xl. 3: "For this is he that was spoken of by the Prophet Esaias, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight." The other evangelists make the same application of it, representing John as the herald of Jesus, the "JEHOVAH" of the Prophet. It was, therefore, in the highest possible sense that they used the term, because they used it as fully equivalent to Jehovah. So again, in Luke i. 16, 17: "And many of the children of Israel shall he turn to THE LORD THEIR GOD, and he shall go before HIM in the spirit and power of Elias." "HIM," unquestionably refers to "the Lord their God;" and we have here a proof that Christ bears that eminent title of Divinity, so frequent in the Old Testament, "the LORD GOD," Jehovah Aleim; and also that Lord answered, in the view of an inspired writer, to the name Jehovah. On this point the Apostle Paul also adds his testimony, Romans x. 13, "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the LORD shall be saved;" which is quoted from Joel ii. 32, "Whosoever shall call on the name of JEHOVAH shall be delivered." Other passages might be added, but the argument does not rest upon their number; these are so explicit, that they are amply sufficient to establish the important conclusion, that, in whatever senses the term "*Lord*" may be used, and though the writers of the New Testament, like ourselves, use it occasionally in a lower sense, yet they use it also in its highest possible sense, and in its loftiest signification, when they intend it to be understood as equivalent to Jehovah, and, in that sense, they apply it to Christ.

But, even when the title "LORD" is not employed to render the name Jehovah, in passages quoted from the Old Testament, but is used as the common appella-

tion of Christ, after his resurrection, the disciples so connect it with other terms, and with circumstances which so clearly imply Divinity, that it cannot reasonably be made a question but that they themselves considered it as a *Divine* title, and intended that it should be so understood by their readers. In that sense they applied it to the Father, and it is clear, that they did not use it in a lower sense when they gave it to the Son. It is put *absolutely*, and by way of *eminence*, "THE LORD." It is joined with "GOD;" so in the passage above quoted from St. Luke, where Christ is called the LORD GOD; and when Thomas, in an act of adoration, calls him "*My* LORD and *my* GOD." When it is used to express dominion, that dominion is represented as *absolute* and *universal*, and, therefore, *divine*. "*He is* LORD *of all.*" "KING *of kings and* LORD *of lords.*" "Thou, LORD, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thy hands. They shall perish; but thou remainest: and they all shall wax old, as doth a garment, and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed; but thou art *the same*, and thy years shall not fail."

Thus, then, the titles of "Jehovah" and "Lord" both prove the Divinity of our Saviour; "for," as it is remarked by Dr. Waterland, "if Jehovah signify the eternal, immutable God, it is manifest that the name is *incommunicable*, since there is but one God; and, if the name be *incommunicable*, then Jehovah can signify nothing but that one God, to whom, and to whom *only*, it is applied. And if both these parts be true, and if it be true, likewise, that this name is applied to Christ, the consequence is irresistible, that Christ is the same one God, not the same person, with the *Father*, to whom also the name Jehovah is attributed, but the same *substance*, the same *being*, in a word, the same *Jehovah*, thus revealed to be more persons than one."

2. Jesus Christ is *called* God: this the adversaries of his Divinity are obliged to confess, and this confession

admits, that the *letter* of Scripture is, therefore, in favor of orthodox opinions. It is, indeed, said, that the term *God*, like the term LORD, is used in an inferior sense; but nothing is gained by this; nothing is, on that account, proved against the Deity of Christ; for it must still be allowed, that it is a term used in Scripture to express the Divine Nature, and that it is so used generally. The question, therefore, is only limited to this; whether our Lord is called *God*, in the highest sense of that appellation. This might, indeed, be argued from those passages in the Old Testament in which the title is given to the Jehovah, "the Lord God" of the Old Testament; but this having been anticipated, I confine myself chiefly to the Evangelists and Apostles.

Matthew i. 23: "Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold a virgin shall be with child and shall bring forth a Son, and they shall call his name EMMANUEL, which being interpreted, is, GOD with us." This is a portion of Scripture which the Socinians, in their "Improved Version," have printed in italics, as of "doubtful authority," though, with the same breath, they allow that it is found "in *all* the manuscripts and versions which are now extant." The ground, therefore, on which they have rested their objection is confessedly narrow and doubtful, and frail as it is, it has been entirely taken from them, and the authority of this scripture fully established. The reason of an attempt, at once so bold and futile, to expunge this passage, and the following part of St. Matthew's history which is connected with it, may be found in the explicitness of the testimony which it bears to our Lord's Divinity, and which no criticism could evade. The prophecy which is quoted by the Evangelist has its difficulties; but they do not in the least affect the argument. Whether we can explain Isaiah or not, that is, whether we can show in what manner the prophecy had a primary accomplishment in the prophet's day or not, St. Matthew is suffi-

ciently intelligible. He tells us, that the words spoken by the prophet were spoken of Christ; and that his miraculous conception took place, "that," *in order that*, "they might be fulfilled;" a mode of expression so strong, that even those who allow the prophets to be quoted sometimes by way of accommodation by the writers of the New Testament, except this instance, as having manifestly, from the terms used, the form of an argument, and not of a mere allusion. Farther, says the sacred historian, "and they shall call his name *Emmanuel*;" that is, according to the idiom of Scripture, where any thing is said to be called what it in reality is, he shall be "*Emmanuel*," and the interpretation is added, "GOD *with us*."

"It is, indeed, objected, that the Divinity of Christ, can no more be argued from this title of Emmanuel than the Divinity of ELI, whose name signifies *my God*, or of *Elihu*, which imports *my God himself*; but it is to be remarked, that by these names such individuals were commonly and constantly known among those with whom they lived. But Immanuel was not the personal name of our Lord, he was not so called by his friends and countrymen familiarly: the personal name which he received was Jesus, by Divine direction, and by this he was known to the world. It follows, therefore, that *Immanuel* was a *descriptive* title, a *name of revelation*, expressive of his Divine character. It is clear, also, that in this passage he is called God; and two circumstances, in addition to that just mentioned, prove that the term is used in its full and highest sense. In Isaiah, from which the passage is quoted by the Evangelist, the land of Judea is called the land of this Immanuel more than seven centuries before he was born. 'And he (the Assyrian) shall pass through Judah; he shall overflow and go over, he shall reach even to the neck, and the stretching out of his wings shall fill the breadth of *thy land*, O IMMANUEL," Chap. viii. 8. Thus is Christ, according to a former argument, represent-

ed as existing before his birth in Judea, and, as the God of the Jews, the proprietor of the land of Israel. This also gives the true explanation of St. John's words, 'He came unto his *own*, [nation,] and his *own* [people] received him not.' The second circumstance which proves the term God, in the title Immanuel, to be used in its highest sense is, that the same person, in the following chapter of Isaiah, is called 'God,' with the epithet of 'mighty,'—'Wonderful, Counsellor, the MIGHTY GOD.' Thus, as Bishop Pearson observes, 'First, he is '*Immanu*,' that is *with us*, for he hath dwelt among us; and when he parted from the earth, he said to his disciples, 'I am *with you alway*, even to the end of the world.' Secondly, he is EL, and that name was given him, as the same prophet testified, 'his name shall be called *Wonderful, Counsellor*, the MIGHTY GOD.' He then who is both properly called EL, that is God, and is also really IMMANU, that is *with us*, must infallibly, be that 'IMMANUEL,' who is '*God with us*.' No inferior Deity, but invested with the full and complete attributes of absolute Divinity—'the Mighty God.'"

"In Luke i. 16, 17, it is said of John Baptist, 'And many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the LORD THEIR GOD, and he shall go before HIM in the spirit and power of Elias.' This passage has been already adduced to prove, that the title 'LORD' is used of Christ in the import of JEHOVAH. But he is called THE LORD their GOD, and, as the term LORD is used in its *highest* sense, so must also the term GOD, which proves that this title is given to our Saviour in its fullest and most extended meaning—'to Jehovah their God,' or 'to their God Jehovah,' for the meaning is the same."

Equally conclusive are the words of the Evangelist in John i. 1: "In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God." Christ is here called God in the highest sense. 1. Because when this title is applied to the Father, in the preceding clause, it must be used in its full import. 2. Because

immediately to call our Lord by the same name as the Father, without any hint of its being used in a lower sense, would have been to mislead the reader on a most important question, if St. John had not regarded him as equal to the Father. 3. Because the creation is ascribed to the "Word," who is called God. "All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made." By this, the absolute Divinity of Christ is infallibly determined, unless we should run into the absurdity of supposing it possible for a creature to create, and not only to create all other created things, but himself also. For, if Christ be not God, he is a creature; and if "not any thing that was made" was made "without him," then he made himself.

"The introduction to St. John's Gospel may, therefore, be considered as an inexpugnable proof that Deity, in its highest, and in no secondary or subordinate, sense is ascribed to our Saviour, under his title God—'and the Word was GOD.' Nor in any other than the highest sense of the term *God* can the confession of Thomas, John xx. 28, be understood. 'And Thomas answered and said unto him, My LORD and my GOD.' Unitarians, however, contend that this may be considered not as a confession, but as an *exclamation*, 'My Lord! and my God!' thereby choosing to put profane, or, at least, vulgar language into the mouth of this Apostle, of which degradation we have certainly no example in the narration of the Evangelists. *Michaelis* has justly observed, that if Thomas had spoken *German*, (he might have added English, French, or Italian,) it might have been contended, with some plausibility, that 'My Lord and my God" was only an irreverent ejaculation; but that Jewish astonishment was thus expressed is wholly without proof or support. Add to this, that the words are introduced, with *said to him*, that is, to Christ; a mere ejaculation, such as that here supposed, is rather an appeal to Heaven. Our Saviour's reply makes it absolutely certain, that the words of

Thomas, though they are in the form of an exclamation, amount to a confession of faith, and were equivalent to a direct assertion of our Saviour's Divinity. Christ commends Thomas' acknowledgment, while he condemns the tardiness with which it is made; but to what did this acknowledgment amount? That Christ was LORD *and* GOD.

"In Titus ii. 13, 'Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the Great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ,' our Lord is not only called God, but the GREAT GOD, which marks the sense in which the term is used by the Apostle, and gives unequivocal evidence of his opinions on the subject of Christ's Divinity. Unitarian interpreters tell us, that 'the Great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ' are two persons, and therefore refer the title 'Great God' to the Father. and accordingly render the text, 'the glorious appearance of the Great God and of our Saviour Jesus Christ.' To this interpretation there are satisfactory answers. Dr. Whitby observes:

"'Here it deserveth to be noted, that it is highly probable, that Jesus Christ is styled *the Great God*, 1. Because, in the original, the article is prefixed only before *the Great God*, and therefore seems to require this construction, the appearance of Jesus Christ, the Great God and our Saviour. 2. Because, as God the Father is not said properly to appear, so that word never occurs in the New Testament, but when it is to be applied to Jesus Christ and to some coming of his; the places in which it is to be found being only these: 2 Thess. ii. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 14; 2 Tim. i. 10; and iv. 1, 8. 3. Because Christ is emphatically styled *our hope, the hope of glory:* Col. i. 23; 1 Tim. i. 1. And, lastly, because not only all the ancient commentators on the place do so interpret this text, but the anti-Nicene fathers also; Hyppolitus, speaking of the appearance of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ; and Clemens of Alexandria, proving Christ to be both God and man, our

Creator, and the Author of all our good things, from these very words of St. Paul.'

"Another passage, in which the appellation *God* is given to Christ, in a connection which necessarily obliges us to understand it in its highest sense, is Heb. i. 8: 'But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O GOD, is for ever and ever.' The argument of the Apostle here determines the sense in which he calls Jesus, the Son, 'GOD,' and the views he entertains of his nature. Angels and men are the only rational *created* beings in the universe which are mentioned by the sacred writers. The Apostle argues, that Christ is superior even to angels; that they are but *ministers*, he a sovereign, seated on a *throne*; that they *worship* him, and that he receives *worship*; that they are *creatures*, but he *creator*. 'Thou, Lord, in the beginning has laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands;' and, full of these ideas of supreme Divinity, he applies a passage to him out the 45th Pslam, which is there addressed to the Messiah, 'Thy throne, O GOD, is for ever and ever.'"

The Unitarians, however, find fault with the translation of this passage, and assume the responsibility of rendering it as follows: "But unto the Son he saith, God is thy throne forever and ever." This interpretation, however, is monstrous, and derives no support from any parallel figurative or eliptical mode of expression in the sacred writings. God the throne of a creature! If so, then a creature must be greater than God, inasmuch as the one who sits upon a throne must be greater than the throne upon which he sits. This, certainly, is strange theology. A creature, in order to support Unitarianism, must become a God, while the infinite Jehovah must be converted into a throne to be occupied by this created Deity; and, finally, all this absurdity must be charged upon the inspired penman.

"'And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him

that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his SON JESUS CHRIST. THIS IS THE TRUE GOD AND ETERNAL LIFE.' 1 John v. 20. Here our Saviour is called the *true God* and *Eternal Life*. The means by which this testimony is evaded, is to interpret the clause 'him that is true,' of the Father, and to refer the pronoun *this*, not to the nearest antecedent, 'his Son Jesus Christ,' but to the most remote, 'him that is true.' All, however, that is pretended by Unitarian critics on this passage is, not that this construction *must*, but that it *may* take place. Yet even this feeble opposition to the received rendering cannot be maintained: for, 1. To interpret the clause, 'him that is true,' of the Father, is entirely arbitrary; and the scope of the epistle, which was to prove that Jesus the Christ was the *true* Son of God, and, therefore, Divine, against those who denied his Divinity, and that 'he had come in the flesh,' in opposition to the heretics who denied his humanity, obliges us to refer that phrase to the Son, and not to the Father. 2. If it could be established, that the Father was intended by 'him that is true,' it would be contrary to grammatical usage to refer the pronoun *this*, is the 'true God and Eternal Life,' to the remote antecedent, without obvious and indisputable necessity.

"'Whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever.' Rom. ix. 5.

"With respect to this text, it is to be noted,

"1. That it continues an enumeration of the particular privileges of the Jewish nation which are mentioned in the preceding verses, and the Apostle adds, 'whose are the fathers,' the patriarchs and prophets, and of whom 'the Christ came.'

"2. That he throws in a clause of limitation with respect to the coming of Christ, '*according to the flesh*,' which clearly states that it was only according to the *flesh*, the humanity of Christ, that he descended from the Jewish nation, and, at the same time, intimates, that he was more than *flesh*, or mere human nature.

"3. The sentence does not end here: the Apostle adds, '*who* is, over all, God blessed for ever;' a relative expression which evidently refers to the antecedent *Christ;* and thus we have an antithesis, which shows the reason why the Apostle introduced the limiting clause, 'according to the flesh;' and explains why Christ, *in one respect*, did descend from the Jews; and *in another* that this could not be affirmed of him: he was 'God over all,' and, therefore, only 'according to the flesh' could he be of human descent.

"4. That this completes the Apostle's purpose to magnify the privileges of his nation: after enumerating many others, he crowns the whole by declaring, that 'God over all,' when he became incarnate for the sake of human salvation, took a body of the seed of Abraham.

"Criticism has, of course, endeavored, if possible, to weaken the argument drawn from this lofty and impregnable passage; but it is of such a kind as greatly to confirm the truth. For, in the first place, various readings of manuscripts cannot here be resorted to for rendering the sense dubious, and all the ancient versions support the present reading. The only method of dealing with this passage left to Unitarians is, therefore, to attempt to obtain a different sense from it by shifting the punctuation. By this device some read, 'and of whom is the Christ according to the flesh. God, who is over all, be blessed for ever.' Others, 'and of whom is the Christ, according to the flesh, who is over all. Blessed be God for ever.' A critic of their own, Mr. Wakefield, whose authority they acknowledge to be great, may, however, here be turned against them. Both these constructions, he acknowledges, appear so awkward, so abrupt, so incoherent, that he could never be brought to relish them in the least degree; and Dr. S. Clarke, who was well disposed to evade this decisive passage, acknowledges that the common reading is the most obvious.

"'Socinus himself rejects it for this very good reason, that *God be blessed*, is an unusual and unnatural construction; for, wherever else these words signify *blessed be God*, *blessed* is put before God, as Luke i. 68: 2 Co. i. 3; Eph. i. 3; 1 Pet. i. 3; and God has an article prefixed to it; nor are they immediately joined together otherwise. The phrase occurs twenty times in the Old Testament, but in every place *blessed* goes before, and the article is annexed to the word *God*, which is a demonstration that this is a perversion of the sense of the Apostle's words.'

"Numerous other passages might be cited, where Christ is called 'GOD:' these only have been selected, not merely because the proof does not rest upon the number of scriptural testimonies, but upon their explicitness, and also because they all associate the term God, as applied to our Saviour, with other titles, or with circumstances which demonstrate, most fully, that that term was used by the inspired penmen in its highest sense of true and proper Deity when they applied it to Christ. Thus we have seen it associated with *Jehovah*; with *Lord*, the New Testament rendering of that ineffible name; with acts of creative energy, as in the introduction to the Gospel of St. John; with the supreme dominion and perpetual stability of the throne of the Son, in the First chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. In the Epistle to Titus, he is called 'the GREAT God;' in 1 John, 'the TRUE God,' and the giver of 'ETERNAL LIFE;' and in the last text examined, his twofold nature is distinguished—*man*, 'according to the flesh,' and, in his higher nature, GOD, 'God over all blessed for evermore."—*Watson.*

IV. The acts ascribed to Christ prove that he is Divine, and absolutely God; for they are such as could have been performed by none but God.

1. He creates. Col. i. 16, 17: "For by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible whether they be

thrones or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." Here, as Dr. Clarke remarks, are four things asserted. 1. That Jesus Christ is the Creator of the universe, of all things that had a beginning, whether they exist in time or in eternity. 2. That whatsoever was created, was created *for* himself: that he was the *sole end* of his work. 3. That he was prior to all creation, to all beings, whether in the visible or invisible worlds. 4. That he is the *preserver* and *governor* of all things; for by him all things consist.

Now, allowing St. Paul to have understood the terms which he used, he must have considered Jesus Christ as being truly and properly *God*; for creation is the proper work of an infinite, unlimited, and unoriginated being; possessed of all perfections in their highest degrees; capable of knowing, willing, and working, infinitely, unlimitedly, and without control: and as creation signifies the production of being, where all was absolute nonentity, so it necessarily implies that the Creator acted of and from himself; for, as previously to this creation there was no being, consequently he could not be actuated by any motive, reason, or impulse, without himself; which would argue there was some being to produce the motive, or impulse, or to give the reason. Creation, therefore, is the work of him who is unoriginated, infinite, unlimited, and eternal. But *Jesus Christ is the Creator of all things;* therefore Jesus Christ must be, according to the plain construction of the Apostle's words, truly and properly GOD.

As, previously to creation, there was no being but God, consequently the great *First Cause* must, in the exertion of his creative energy, have respect to himself alone; for he could no more have respect to that which had no existence, than he could have been moved by nonexistence, to produce existence or creation; the Creator, therefore, must make every thing *for* himself.

Should it be objected, that Christ created officially, or by delegation, I answer, this is impossible; for, as creation requires absolute and unlimited power, or omnipotence, there can be but one Creator; because it is impossible that there can be two or more omnipotents, infinites, or eternals. It is therefore evident, that creation cannot be effected officially, or by delegation; for this would imply a being conferring the office, and delegating such power: and that the being to whom it was delegated was a dependent being; consequently, not unoriginated and eternal: but this the nature of creation proves to be absurd: 1. The thing being impossible in itself, because no limited being could produce a work that necessarily requires omnipotence. 2. It is impossible: because if omnipotence be delegated, he to whom it is delegated had it not before; and he who delegates it ceases to have it; and consequently ceases to be *God;* and the other to whom it is delegated becomes God; because such attributes as those with which he is supposed to be invested, are essential to the nature of God. On this supposition, *God ceases to exist,* though infinite and eternal; and another, not naturally infinite and eternal, becomes such: and thus an infinite and eternal being ceases to exist, and another infinite and eternal being is produced in time, and has a beginning, which is absurd. Therefore, as Christ is the creator, he did not create by delegation, or in any official way.

Again, if he had created by delegation, or officially, it would have been for that being who gave him that office, and delegated to him the requisite power; but the text says, that *all things were made* BY *him, and* FOR *him,* which is a demonstration that the Apostle understood Jesus Christ to be truly and essentially God.

As all creation necessarily exists in time, and had a commencement, and there was an infinite duration in which it did not exist; whatever was before or prior to that, must be no part of creation; and the being who

existed prior to creation, and before all things, all existence of every kind, must be the unoriginated and eternal God: but St. Paul says, *Jesus Christ was before all things;* therefore the Apostle conceived Jesus Christ to be truly and essentially God.

2. As every effect depends upon its cause, and cannot exist without it, so creation, which is an effect of the power and skill of the Creator, can only exist and be preserved by a continuance of that energy that first gave it being. Hence God, as the preserver, is as necessary to the continuance of all things, as God the creator was to their original production. But this preserving or continuing power is here ascribed to Christ; for the Apostle says, And *by him do all things consist;* for, as all being was derived from him, as its cause, so all being must subsist by him, as the effect subsists by and through its cause. This is another proof that the Apostle considered Jesus Christ to be truly and properly God, as he attributes to him the preservation of all created things; which property of preservation, belongs to God alone: therefore, Jesus Christ is, according to the plain obvious meaning of every expression in this text, truly, properly, independently, and essentially God.—*Clarke.*

3. But our Lord himself professes to do other acts, besides the great act of creating, which are peculiar to God; and such acts are also attributed to him by his inspired Apostles. His preserving of all things made by him has already been mentioned, and which implies not only a Divine power, but also *omnipresence,* since he must be present to all things, in order to their constant conservation. The final destruction of the whole frame of material nature is also as expressly attributed to him as its creation. "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thine hands; these shall perish, but thou remainest, and as a vesture SHALT THOU FOLD THEM UP, and they shall be changed." Here omnipotent power is

seen "changing," and removing, and taking away the vast universe of material things with the same ease as it was spoken into being and at first disposed into order. Generally, too, our Lord claims to perform the works of his Father. "If I do not the WORKS of my Father, believe me not; but if I DO, though ye believe not me, believe the works." Should this, even, be restrained to the working of miracles, the argument remains the same. No Prophet, no Apostle, ever used such language in speaking of his miraculous gifts. Here Christ declares that he performs the works of his Father; not merely that the Father worked *by* him, but that he himself did the works of God; which can only mean works proper or peculiar to God, and which a Divine power only could effect. So the Jews understood him, for, upon this declaration, "they sought again to take him." That this power of working miracles was in him an *original* power, appears also from his bestowing that power upon his disciples. "Behold I GIVE unto you power to tread on serpents, and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy, and nothing shall by any means hurt you." Luke x. 10. "And HE GAVE them power and authority over all devils, and to cure diseases." Luke ix. 1. Their miracles were, therefore, to be performed in his *name*, by which the power of effecting them was expressly reserved to him. "In MY NAME shall they cast out devils;" "and HIS NAME, through faith in HIS NAME hath made this man strong."

4. The manner in which our Lord promises the Holy Spirit is farther in proof that he performs acts peculiar to the Godhead. He speaks of "sending the Spirit" in the language of one who had an original right and an inherent power to bestow that wondrous gift which was to impart miraculous energies, and heavenly wisdom, comfort, and purity to human minds. Does the Father *send* the Spirit? Christ claims the same power,—"the Comforter, whom *I will send* unto you." The Spirit is, on this account, called the "the Spirit of Christ" and

"the Spirit of God." Thus the giving of the Spirit is indifferently ascribed to the Son and to the Father; but when that gift is *mediately* bestowed by the Apostles, no such language is assumed by them: they pray to Christ, and to the Father in his name, and he, their exalted Master, sheds forth the blessing—"therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, HE hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear."

5. Another of the unquestionably peculiar acts of God, is the forgiveness of sins. In the manifest reason of the thing, no one can forgive but the party offended; and, as sin is the transgression of the law of God, he, alone, is the offended party, and he only, therefore, can forgive. Mediately, others may declare his pardoning acts, or the conditions on which he determines to forgive; but, authoritatively, there can be no actual forgiveness of sins against God but by God himself. But Christ forgives sin authoritatively, and he is, therefore, God. One passage is all that is necessary to prove this. "He said to the sick of the palsy, Son, be of good cheer, *thy sins be forgiven thee.*" The scribes who were present understood that he did this authoritatively, and assumed, in this case, the rights of Divinity. They therefore said, among themselves, "This man blasphemeth." What, then, is the conduct of our Lord? Does he admit that he only ministerially declared, in consequence of some revelation, that God had forgiven the sins of the paralytic? On the contrary, he works a miracle to prove to them that the very right which they disputed was vested in him, that he had this authority—"but, that ye may KNOW that the Son of man hath POWER on earth to forgive sins, then saith he to the sick of the palsy, Arise, take up thy bed, and go into thine own house."

Such were the acts performed by our Saviour, in the days of his sojourn on earth, and which he is represented, by his inspired Apostles, to be still constantly per-

forming, or as having the power to perform. If any creature is capable of doing the same mighty works, then is all distinction between created finite natures and the uncreated Infinite destroyed. If such a distinction, in fact, exists; if neither creation, preservation, nor salvation be possible to a mere creature, we have seen that they are possible to Christ, because he actually creates, preserves, and saves; and the inevitable conclusion is, THAT HE IS VERY GOD.—*Watson.*

V. Jesus Christ is eternal, and therefore must be God; for God is the only eternal being. The eternity of Christ may be argued in the first place from the introduction to St. John's Gospel: "In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God." "The grammatical construction of this passage," says Drew, "evidently imports that this word was in existence at the beginning. He does not say that his existence commenced at the beginning, but that in the beginning *was* the word. The imperfect tense of the verb to be, which is here used, evidently denotes that he existed antecedently to the beginning; and in a comprehensive expression like this before us, we cannot conceive how the eternal existence of Deity could be more fully expressed, if the Apostle had directed our views to that subject.

"It is of little consequence where we fix the period of beginning. Because the proposition expresses a universal affirmation, which includes all. If we fix the beginning at the creation of man, the word *was* then. If we fix it at the commencement of time, the word then was: and if we carry back our views to the commencement of angelic existence, the word then was. For in either case, 'In the beginning was the word.'

"Now that which was in existence at the beginning, certainly existed before the beginning; and that which existed before the beginning, must be without beginning; and that which was without beginning, must be eternal."

2. The eternity of Christ is also clearly established by the fact that he is the Creator, or first cause of all things. St. John says, "All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made," John i. 1. And the Apostle Paul says, Col. i. 16, "For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities, or powers: *all* things were created by him and for him." It is here affirmed by two inspired apostles that *all things* were made or created by Christ, and if all things were created by him, he was certainly before any thing was created. But lest this general expression, "all things," should be restricted in its meaning, the Apostle Paul adds "all things that are in *heaven* and upon earth;" and, lest the invisible spirits in heaven should be thought to be excluded, he further adds "*things visible* and *things invisible*;" and, lest the invisible things should be understood of *inferior* angels or spiritual beings, and the high and glorious beings who excel in strength, and are, in Scripture, invested with other elevated properties, should be excepted, the apostle is still more particular, and adds "whether thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers;" thereby ascribing the creation of every thing, whether high or low, within the wide spread universe of God to Jesus Christ. But, as above remarked, if all things were created by Christ, he must have existed before any thing was created; and if he existed before any thing was created, it is evident that he was not created, and if he was not created, he must be self-existent, and therefore eternal.

3. Christ is before all things. Col. i. 17: "And he is before all things, and by him all things consist." "Now," as Drew remarks, "he who is before all things, is not a thing; for if he was, he could not be before all things, unless he was before himself, which cannot possibly be. He, therefore, who is not a thing, but before all things, must be without beginning, and he who exists without beginning, must be eternal."

4. The eternity of our blessed Saviour is also clearly exhibited in the following words of the Prophet Isaiah: "Unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given, his name shall be called Wonderful, Councellor, the mighty God, the *Everlasting Father*, the Prince of Peace," Isaiah ix. 6. "'Everlasting Father,' in this text, is variously rendered by the principal orthodox critics; but every rendering is in consistency with the application of a positive eternity to the Messiah, of which this is a prediction. Bishop Loth says, 'The Father of the everlasting age.' Bishop Stock, 'The Father of eternity;' i. e. the owner of it." But, if he is the Everlasting Father, or the Father of the everlasting age, the owner of eternity, he must be eternal.

I am, however, aware that our opponents endeavor to urge the application of this name to the Messiah, against the doctrine of the Trinity. But it should be remembered that the Prophet is here describing the nature of the Messiah, and therefore gives him this name (Everlasting Father) as a name of nature. He is not describing his mode of existence with the Father and the Holy Spirit, but his *essence* as true and very God. For this reason, the application of this name to *Jesus Christ*, by no means militates against the doctrine of the Trinity, or the peculiar relation of *Christ* in that Trinity; but establishes and confirms it. For, if Christ be the *Everlasting Father*, and if there is but one God, the Father, then *Christ* being God, that divine person who is usually styled the Father, must be of one essence with Christ, or there would be two Gods. But if Christ and the Father are of one essence, and the Father be eternal, which is admitted by all, then Christ must be eternal also.

5. The eternity of Christ appears evident from the fact that he claims to be the I AM; a title by which Jehovah declares his self-existence and eternity to Moses, by saying, Exod. iii. 14, "I AM THAT I AM." "And our Lord appears to refer to the same passage, and cer-

tainly means the same thing, when he says, John viii. 58, 'Before Abraham was I am.' In these last words, we see the eternity of Christ, not only in their resemblance, and apparent reference to those words of Jehovah by which he declares his eternal nature, but also in the very circumstances in which they were spoken. Our Lord had just told the Jews, verse 56, 'Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day; and he saw it, and was glad.' By which the Jews understood him to mean that he existed when Abraham was on earth; and to which they replied, verse 57, 'Thou art not fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham.' Then our Lord confirmed what they had understood him to mean, *Before Abraham was* I AM, *I am from eternity.* I am now, and I was with Abraham, and he acknowledged me to be his God, and desired me as his Saviour. That the Jews understood him to profess that he was the eternal God, and that they meant to punish him for supposed blasphemy according to their law, is evident from verse 59, 'Then took they up stones to cast at him.'"—*Hedding's Sermon on the Deity of Christ.* But does our Saviour correct this wrong impression, (for wrong it must be if he was not the eternal God,) which he would have done if they had been mistaken? "No! to have so acted, would have been derogatory to *his* dignity; and injurious to *their* interests. He actually repeats his claim to the character. He actually enforces his pretensions, to a supernatural priority of existence. He even heightens both. He mounts up far beyond Abraham. He ascends beyond all the orders of creation. And he places himself with God at the head of the universe. He thus arrogates to himself all that high pitch of dignity, which the Jews expected their Messiah to assume. This he does too in the most energetic manner, that his simplicity of language, so natural to inherent greatness, would possibly admit. He also introduces what he says, with much solemnity in the form, and with more in the repetition. 'Verily, verily, I say

unto you,' he cries, 'BEFORE ABRAHAM WAS, I AM.' He says not of himself, as he says of Abraham, 'Before he was, I was.' This indeed would have been sufficient, to affirm his existence previous to Abraham. But it would not have been sufficient, to declare what he *now* meant to assert, his full claim to the majesty of the Messiah. He therefore drops all forms of language, that could be accommodated to the mere creatures of God. He arrests one, that was appropriate to the Godhead itself. 'Before Abraham *was*,' or still more properly, 'Before Abraham was MADE,' he says, 'I AM.' He thus gives himself the signature of *uncreated* and *continual* existence, in direct opposition to *contingent* and *created*. He says of himself,

That an Eternal NOW forever lasts,

with him. He attaches to himself that very stamp of *eternity*, which God appropriates to his Godhead in the Old Testament, and from which an Apostle afterwards describes Jesus Christ expressly to be 'the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.' Nor did the Jews pretend to misunderstand him now. They could not. They heard him directly and decisively vindicating the noblest rights of their Messiah, and the highest honors of their God, to himself. They considered him as a mere pretender to *those*. They therefore looked upon him, as a blasphemous arrogator of *those*. 'Then took they up stones, to cast at him' as a blasphemer; as what indeed he was in his pretensions to be God, if he had not been in reality their Messiah and their God in one. But he instantly proved himself to their very senses, to be both; by exerting the energetic powers of his Godhead, upon them. For he '*hid* himself; and went out of the temple, *going through the midst of them*; and so passed by.'"—*Whitaker*.

6. Christ is styled the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the *first* and the *last*. Now, by these very titles is the eternity of God express in Isaiah xliv.

6: "Thus saith the Lord the King of Israel, and his Redeemer the Lord of hosts; I am the first, and I am the last; and besides me there is no God." The same sentiment is expressed, though in different words, in Isaiah xliii. 10: "That ye may know and believe me, and understand that I am he: before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me. I, even I, am the Lord; and besides me there is no Saviour." But, in Rev. i. 11, Christ is expressly styled the *first* and the *last*. Therefore, if the passage quoted from Isaiah proves the eternity of God, which is admitted by all; then the one from Revelation proves the eternity of Christ: for the same titles are there assumed by him as absolutely and as explicitly as they are by God in Isaiah; and they clearly affirm that the being to whom they are applied had no beginning, and will have no end.

He is also said, in Rev. i. 8, to be the Alpha and Omega, that is from eternity to eternity. "This mode of speech is borrowed from the Jews, who express the *whole compass of things by aleph and tau;* the *first* and *last* letters of the *Hebrew* alphabet: but as St. John was writing in *Greek*, he accommodates the whole to the Greek alphabet, of which *Alpha* and *Omega* are the first and last letters. With the Rabbins, *mealeph vead tau*, from aleph to tau, expressed the whole of a matter, *from the beginning to the end."—(Clark's notes on Rev. i.* 8.) Therefore, Alpha and Omega, in the text under consideration, must express the whole of eternity; consequently, Christ must be from eternity to eternity; that is, he must be an eternal self-existent being.

But it is objected by our opponents, that if these titles, *Alpha* and *Omega*, *first* and *last*, &c., prove the eternity of Christ, or that he existed before every other being, it will also prove that he will exist after every other being; which would argue the annihilation of every being in the universe, except God.

In answer to this, we would remark, that the same reasoning would, with the same propriety, disprove the eternity of God the Father; for it is expressly said, Isah. xliv. 10, that he is the *first* and the *last*; but this, according to the above reasoning, cannot be; that is, God cannot be an eternal self-existent being, for if he is, he must exist *after* all other beings; but if he exists *after* all other beings, then all other beings must be annihilated. But all other beings will not be annihilated, therefore God cannot be the first and last, or an eternal Being, which is the import of these terms. Consequently, according to this reasoning of our opponents, God will cease to exist, or else every other being in the universe will come to an end, and if Christ is not God, he must be annihilated with the rest. Our opponents, therefore, in order to sustain their position that the above mentioned titles do not prove the eternity of Christ, have either to annihilate God, or every other being in the universe; consequently the world and the world's Saviour.

We would, however, remark, before we dismiss this subject, that, by these titles, *Alpha* and *Omega*, first and last, &c., being applied to Christ, we are not to suppose that he will be the last being in existence, or that angels and men will ever cease to exist; but we are to understand them as expressive of the whole of eternity; for as the whole compass of things are embraced between the *first* and the *last*, or as the alphabet is included within *Alpha* and *Omega*, so the whole of eternity is included in the existence of Jesus Christ.

7. "ETERNAL LIFE, when used as it is frequently in St. John's Epistles, is also a clear designation of the eternity of our Saviour. 'For the LIFE was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and show unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifest unto us.' 1 John i. 2. In the first clause of this text, Christ is called the life; he is then said to be '*eternal*;' and, that no mistake should arise,

the Apostle endeavors to convince us that he *designed* to declare the eternal existence of Christ, he shows that he ascribes eternity to him in the pre-existent state, 'that eternal life which *was* with the Father, and with him before he was manifested' to men."—*Watson.* The eternal underived existence of our Saviour could not be more unequivocally expressed.

8. The eternity of Christ is also established by the testimony of Solomon. Proverbs viii. 22, 23: "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from beginning, or ever the earth was." That this passage refers to Christ, is evident from several considerations.

1. It is admitted by our opponents. (*See Millard's True Messiah, pp.* 91.)

2. Personal acts are here ascribed to wisdom spoken of in this chapter. He is represented as standing, and crying, and performing various other acts which clearly denote personality.

3. He is said to possess wisdom. But it would be absurd to say of wisdom, as an attribute, that it possessed wisdom and sound understanding. Therefore this passage must refer to Christ the personal wisdom of God. It may, therefore, be considered as a strong proof in favor of his eternity; for it affirms of him that he was set up from *everlasting*, from the *beginning*, or ever the earth was; and that Jehovah possessed him in the *beginning of his way, before his works* of old. Now if the Lord possessed him in the beginning of his way, it is evident that he must be eternal, or else that the ways of God are not eternal.

Again, if the Lord possessed him *before* his works of *old*, or his most *ancient* works, then he is not one of his works; consequently, he cannot be created; and if not created, he must be an eternal self-existent being. But finally, in order to render the doctrine still more certain, the text affirms that he was set up from *everlasting*, or from eternity, and therefore he must be eternal.

9. "This doctrine is most unequivocally taught in the prophecy of Micah, chap. v. 2: 'But thou, Bethlehem Ephrata, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall come forth unto me that is to be Ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.' This passage must ever stand as an irrefutable proof of the eternity of our adorable Saviour; for he is, here expressly declared to be from *everlasting*, as it is rendered by the LXX. and the Vulgate, and critics generally, 'from the days of *eternity*.' So decisive is this text in favor of the eternity of Christ, that Unitarians are under the necessity of resorting to the most violent criticism in order to evade its force."—*(Watson.)* But the only ground they occupy which has any *show* of plausibility is, that the word everlasting does not imply endless duration. To support this, it is said that it is frequently applied to things which must necessarily come to an end, as the everlasting hills.

In reply to this, we would remark,

1. That in all such cases as the one given above when the term everlasting is applied to earthly objects, it is always limited by the noun which follows it. But what is there to limit it in the text under consideration? The noun to be supplied (if a noun is supplied at all,) is duration. But if this was supplied the text would read, "whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting duration." This reading, however, instead of limiting the word everlasting, in the text under consideration, renders it, if possible, still more expressive of the eternity of the Saviour; for duration is certainly endless.

2. If being from everlasting does not prove Christ to be eternal, then the Bible fails to express the eternity of God the Father; for this is the very language by which the eternity of the Father is declared. Psalms xc. 2: "*From* everlasting to everlasting thou art God;" and Hab. i. 12: "Art thou not *from* everlasting. O Lord, my God?"

There is, perhaps, no language in Scripture more expressive of the eternal existence of God than the language just quoted. But if the passage from Micah does not prove the eternity of Christ, these must forever fail of proving the eternity of the Father; for if the being from everlasting does not prove Christ to be eternal, then the being from everlasting cannot prove the Father to be eternal. If, however, it does prove the Father to be eternal, then the Son must be eternal also. Our opponents are, therefore, under the necessity of admitting the eternal existence of Christ, or of giving up the idea that the Scriptures teach the eternity of God the Father.

Having, as we consider, fully established the doctrine of the eternal pre-existence of our Saviour, a doctrine which is inseparably connected with the gospel system, and upon the truth of which hangs the hope of a fallen world, we shall pass to notice an objection which is very clamorously urged against it. This objection is founded upon the sonship of Christ. "It is said that if Christ be the Son of God, he cannot be eternal; for son implies a father; and father implies, in reference to the son, precedency in time. Again, *father* and *son* imply the idea of generation; and generation implies *a time* in which it *was* effected, and a time antecedent to that in which it *was* effected. Consequently, as Jesus Christ is the Son of God, he must have been generated or begotten, and therefore cannot be eternal. Again, it is very triumphantly asked, how can a son be as old as his father?

However plausible this objection may appear to superficial thinkers, it is presumed that when fairly examined it will appear, to the candid and reflecting mind, to possess but very little weight, especially when contrasted with the numerous and overwhelming arguments to which it stands opposed; for,

1. If Jesus Christ is truly and properly the Son of God, in the common acceptation of the term son, (a

doctrine for which many of our opponents contend,) he certainly must partake of the nature of God; for it is evident that every son partakes of the nature of his father. But if he partakes of the nature of God, he must certainly be eternal, or else the Divine nature is not eternal.

2. If Jesus Christ is properly the Son of God in his Divine nature, he must not only partake of the same nature of his Father, but he must also have eternally existed as the Son, or the Divine nature must have changed; for upon the supposition that the Son is not eternal, there must have been a period when the Divine nature existed in the person of the Father only. But now it exists in the Father and the Son, consequently, it must have changed.

We therefore see that to deny the eternal pre-existence of Jesus Christ, and at the same time hold that he is truly and properly the Son of God, in the common acceptation of that term, is, in fact, to deny the eternity of God the Father, and contend for the mutability of the Divine nature.

There is no way for our opponents to avoid these irresistable conclusions, which pierce the very vitals of their theology, but by admitting Christ to be eternal, or by supposing the term Son is applied to him in a restricted and peculiar sense. If they say that Christ is eternal, they yield the point for which we contend. If they say that the term Son is applied to him in a *restricted* and *peculiar* sense, they then give up the whole force of their objection. For if Jesus Christ is the Son of God in a *peculiar* sense, and not in the sense in which the term son commonly imports, his being called the Son of God in that *peculiar* sense can form no objection to his *eternity*. Consequently, the eternity of Christ remains with all its force against the Unitarian hypothesis, proving, beyond all possibility of contradiction, that he is God; for God is the only eternal being.

VI. Having shown that Jesus Christ is an eternal unoriginated being, we now propose proving that he is immutable, which is another distinguishing attribute of God.

1. We argue his immutability from his eternity. That Jesus Christ is eternal has been abundantly proved; consequently, to suppose that he is subject to change is to suppose that an eternal being may change; and to suppose that an eternal can change is to suppose that God may change. But God cannot change; for he expressly says in Malachi iii. 6, "I am the Lord; I change not;" and if God cannot change, as he is the only eternal being, then an eternal being cannot change. But Jesus Christ is eternal, therefore he must be immutable and absolutely God.

2. The immutability of Christ appears from his Divinity. That he is a Divine person is admitted by our opponents. Mr. Millard, in his work entitled the True Messiah, page 114, says, "As Christ proceeded forth from God, and was made flesh, he is far superior to human, and is DIVINE." Consequently, in founding an argument in favor of his immutability, upon his Divinity, when it is so clearly admitted, cannot be considered as begging the question, or as assuming more than what is granted. If, however, he is Divine, it is evident that he must be immutable, unless we suppose that a Divine being can change. But if a Divine being can change, then we arrive at the conclusion that God is a changeable being. But it is admitted by all that God is unchangeable, therefore Divinity cannot change; and if Divinity cannot change, and Christ be a Divine person, then he cannot change, but must be immutable. There is no way of escaping the force of this conclusion, but by saying that there are two kinds of Divinity, a doctrine which is wholly unsupported by Scripture.

3. It is contended by our opponents that Christ is the proper Son of God, consequently, as we have already remarked, he must partake of the nature of God, for

every Son partakes of the nature of his father. This is also admitted by Mr. Millard, in the work above mentioned, page 112: "He partook of his Father;" and on page 113 he says, "that the Son of God partook of, or proceeded forth from God his father, is perfectly consistent with Scripture." But if he partook of the nature of his Father, or, as Mr. M. has it, "of his Father," he must be as unchangeable as his Father. Again, if he "partook of God" he must be a part of God, and therefore of the same essence of his Father; consequently he must be immutable, or the very nature of God is subject to change; and if God is changeable he is not a perfect or infinite being.

4. If Christ is not immutable, what confidence have we to trust in him as a Saviour? Notwithstanding he has poured forth his blood for us upon the cross, rose for our justification, and is now our Mediator and intercessor at the bar of offended justice, yet, on the supposition that he is mutable, he may change, and intercede for man no longer, and that too without the noncompliance with any of the conditions of the gospel on the part of man; or he may change the entire plan of salvation, alter the conditions of the gospel, and leave us without a knowledge of the conditions upon which he will finally be pleased to save us. Yea, upon the supposition that he is not immutable, but mutable and changeable, he may finally become a sinner himself, and man be left without a mediator, without an intercessor, and without a Saviour. Who, then, would dare to trust their hopes of heaven on Jesus Christ, if he is not immutable?

5. The immutability of Christ is plainly taught in the Sacred Scriptures. Paul, in his letter to the Hebrews xiii. 8, uses the following language: "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." Here immutability and eternity, which is inseparably connected with it, are both ascribed to Christ. But immutability is an attribute peculiar to Jehovah. Mal. iii.

6: "For I am the Lord, and change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed." "All creatures," says Bishop Hedding, "are subject to change, but Christ is always the same," "*the same yesterday, to-day and forever*," therefore he is not a mere creature, but he is that very immutable being who says, "*I change not.*"

That the phrase "*the same yesterday, to-day and forever*" is expressive of immutability, needs no proof; therefore Jesus Christ is immutable and eternal.

"A similar and most solemn description of eternity and immutability occurs in Heb. i. 10—12: 'Thou, Lord, in the beginning has laid the foundation of the earth: and the heavens are the works of thy hands. They shall perish; but thou remainest: and they shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall he changed; but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.' These words are quoted from Pslam cii., which all acknowledge to be a lofty description of the eternity of God. They are here applied to Christ; and of *him* they affirm that he was before the material universe—that it was created by him—that he has absolute power over it—that he will destroy it—that he will do this with infinite ease, as one who folds up a vesture; and that, amidst the decay and changes of material things, he remains *the same*. The immutability here ascribed to Christ is not, however, that of a created Spirit, which will remain when the material universe is destroyed; for then there would be nothing *proper* to Christ in the text; nothing but in which angels and men participate with him, and the words would be deprived of all meaning. His immutability and duration are peculiar, and a contrast is implied between his existence and that of all created things. They are *dependent*, he is *independent* and *necessary*," (*Watson,*) and therefore he must be an eternal immutable being.

"Thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail."

These words were undoubtedly spoken by the Psalmist of the true God; the Prophets having so often informed us that he only made the heavens and and the earth; besides, the preceding words cannot be understood of any but JEHOVAH. Either, then, the inspired writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews did not understand the passage he produced, or he knew that the immutable God was described by it; for the sublime characters contained in it are so peculiar to him that there is no instance of the Prophets applying them to any other. But the Apostle, in the passage quoted from Hebrews, applies them to Jesus Christ, therefore he must be the immutable and eternal God.

But it is objected to the immutability of Christ, that he grew in stature, that he increased in wisdom and knowledge, and underwent various other changes, all of which are said to be opposed to his immutability. It should, however, be remembered that he was man as well as God; or, as it is finely expressed in the language of the Methodist Church, in him were united "two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and manhood." *(See Discipline.)* This union of the human and Divine nature in the person of Jesus Christ is so clearly taught in the Sacred Scriptures, that it will not be necessary, in this place, to say much in its defence, especially as we intend to dwell more fully upon this point in another part of this work. We will, however, quote a few passages of Scripture which, from their explicitness, must establish both the Divinity and humanity of Christ, at least in the minds of those who are not so strongly attached to their preconceived opinions as to be incapable of feeling the force of gospel truth. In Heb. ii. 14, the Apostle, speaking of Christ, says, "Forasmuch, then, as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself, likewise, took part of the same." Here the Divine nature is plainly recognized as taking upon it flesh and blood, or human nature. But lest it should be said that he took upon

him the physical and not the intellectual part of our nature, the Apostle adds, verse 16, "For verily he took not upon him the nature of angels, but he took upon him the *seed of Abraham.*" Therefore he must have possessed both a human soul and body, or else the seed of Abraham did not.

But if the seed of Abraham (the Jews) *did* possess human souls and bodies, Jesus Christ must have possessed the same; consequently, he was a perfect man, and as such he passed through the various changes above mentioned while in his Divine nature he remains the same, the immutable the unchangeable God.

Unless Unitarians are willing to admit this, they must not only deny that the seed of Abraham possessed a human nature, but they must also deny that the Bible is the word of God, for in one place it says that Jesus Christ is "the same yesterday, to-day and forever," while in others it represents him as passing through various changes; both of which cannot be true, unless the union of two natures in the person of Christ be admitted; therefore, upon the theory of our opponents, which denies this union, the Bible must be contradictory and false.

VII. To these essential attributes of Deity, to be without beginning and without change, is added that of being extended through all space. He is not only immutable and eternal, but *omnipresent.* He therefore declares himself to be in heaven and upon earth at the same time. 1 John iii. 13: "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the son of man which *is in* heaven." In this passage, "our Lord probably designed to correct a false notion among the Jews, viz. that Moses had to ascend to heaven in order to get the Law. It is not Moses who is to be heard now, but *Jesus;* Moses did not ascend to heaven, but the son of man is come down from heaven to reveal the divine will. And lest a wrong meaning should be taken from the foregoing expression,

and it should be imagined that in order to manifest himself upon earth, he must necessarily leave heaven; our blessed Lord qualified it by saying, 'the son of man which is in heaven.' Showing that he was in heaven and upon earth at the same time; pointing out by this, the ubiquity or omnipresence of his nature: a character essentially belonging to God; for no being can possibly exist in more places than *one* at the same time, but HE who *fills the heavens and the earth.*"—*(Clark.)* But according to the above passage, Jesus Christ did exist in more than one place at the same time; for he was in heaven while upon earth. Therefore, Jesus Christ must be the omnipresent God.

2. The omnipresence of Christ is most clearly taught in Matth. xviii. 20: "For where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them." Here our Saviour most expressly promises to be with his children wherever they shall be assembled in his name. But this is a promise which can only be fulfilled by an omnipresent being: for the children of God are assembled in various places at the same time; and if Christ redeems his promise, if he is wherever they are assembled, he must be at the same moment in all these different places; consequently, he must be in Europe, Asia, Africa, and America, yea, in the various Islands of the Sea, and wherever there is an assembly of his saints, at the same time. No being, however, who is not omnipresent, can be in more than one place at once. We must, therefore, conclude that Jesus Christ is omnipresent, or that he has not the ability to perform his promise.

But it is contended by some that this promise is to be limited to the apostolic age. But were this granted, what would the concession avail? In the apostolic age, the disciples met in the name of their Lord many times in the week, and in innumerable parts of the world at the same time, in Judea, Asia Minor, Europe, &c. He, therefore, who could be "in the midst of

them," even in the apostles' day, whenever and wherever they assembled, must be omnipresent.

To say that Christ is in the midst of our religious assemblies "by his Spirit," is not sufficient. "For if the Spirit intended be the Spirit of Christ, Christ must certainly be omnipresent; because that Spirit is present, with devout worshippers, in all places at the same time. But that Jesus is omnipresent, our opponents will not allow. The Spirit in question, therefore, must be that of the Father, and not of Christ: consequently, not our Lord, but the Divine Father, is present in our assemblies," *(Abbadie)* whereas, it is Christ who made the promise contained in the text under consideration, and who promises to be with his people.

3. "At the very moment of his ascension, that is, just when, as to his bodily presence, he was leaving his disciples, he promises still to be with them, and calls their attention to this promise by an emphatic particle," *(Watson)* "And *Lo I am with you always*, even to the end of the world." Now I ask if Christ is able to fulfill this promise which for eighteen hundred years has been as an anchor to his ministering servants, supporting them in all their trials and temptations, encouraging them to persevere in the discharge of duty amidst the most discouraging and trying circumstances, enabling them to rejoice while in the dungeon or upon the rack, and finally to triumph in a martyr's death? If he is, he must be omnipresent; for his ministers are now lifting the standard of the cross in every quarter of the globe.

> "From Greenland's icy mountains,
> From India's coral strand,
> Where Afric's sunny fountains
> Roll down their golden sand,"

they are heard offering salvation in the name of Jesus to a lost and ruined world. And wherever they are to be found preaching the gospel of Jesus Christ, whether in the consecrated sanctuary, reared by the hand of ci-

vilization, or in the savage wigwam, whether under the scorching sun of the torrid zone, or in the frozen regions of the poles, Jesus is always with them, and has promised to be with them to the end of time. Therefore, he must be omnipresent; for no being who is not omnipresent can be in more than one place at the same time.

It is, however, contended that the presence, referred to in this promise, is a spiritual presence, and that it was confined to the apostles previous to the destruction of Jerusalem, or that it was the miraculous power which the apostles possessed before this period. "Let even this be allowed, though it is a very partial view of the promise; then if till the destruction of Jerusalem, the apostles were 'always,' at all times, able to work miracles, the power to enable them to effect these wonders, must 'always,' and in all *places*, have been present with them; and if that was not a human endowment, if a power superior to that of man were requisite for the performance of the miracles, and that power was the power of Christ, then he was really, though spiritually, present with them, unless the attribute of power can be separated from its subject, and the power of Christ be where he himself is not. This, however, is a low view of the import of the promise, 'Lo, I am with you,' which, both in the Old and New Testaments, signifies to be present with any one, to help, comfort, and succor him."—*(Watson.)* We therefore see that to verify this promise, even to the apostles, our Saviour must be omnipresent.

4. The omnipresence of our Saviour is, also, clearly established by the fact that he is the preserver of all things. 2 Pet. iii. 7: "But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of Judgment and perdition of ungodly men." Now, if the heavens and the earth are kept in store or reserved unto fire by the word, which is Christ, they must be preserved by him, and if they are preserved by him, he must extend

through them all and fill them with his immediate presence; unless we can suppose that his power can be exerted in the preservation of the heavens and earth, including the whole planetary system, when entirely separate from him.

Again, it is said, in Col. i. 17, that, "by him all things consist." This, indeed, necessarily follows from what the Apostle affirms of him in the preceding verse, viz. that he created all things. For, as all things were derived from him, as their cause, so all things must consist, or be preserved by him, as the effect subsists by and through its cause. The Apostle then, here, not only attributes the creation, but the conservation of all things to Christ; but to preserve them, his presence must be co-extensive with them, and thus the universe of matter and created spirits, heaven and earth, must be filled with his power and presence. This short sentence, "By him all things consist," implies that our Lord's presence extends through every part of the creation: to every being and system in the universe; a most striking and emphatical description of his omnipresence. For, if all things consist by Christ, he must be every where to uphold them.

5. Jesus Christ is represented as dwelling *in* his children. In Eph. iii. 17, the Apostle prays that Christ may dwell *in* the hearts of his brethren. And, in Col. i. 27, this indwelling of Christ appears to be the burthen of the Apostle's preaching. "Christ *in* you, the hope of glory: whom we preach." But this prayer of the Apostle, who was under the inspiring influence of the Holy Ghost, must, forever, remain unanswered; and his preaching must be false and vain, if Jesus Christ be not omnipresent. For how can our Saviour dwell *in* the hearts of his children, either by faith, or as the hope of glory, if he is not every where present? It would be impossible. For the children of God are in numerous places at the same time. Even in the apostolic age they were scattered throughout Judea, Asia Minor, Eu-

rope, and some parts of Africa. Therefore, if Christ dwells in all their hearts, a blessing for which the Apostle prayed, and a doctrine which he preached, then he must be in all these places at the same time. But a being who is not omnipresent, can only be in *one* place at once. Therefore, Christ must be omnipresent, or, as above remarked, the Apostle's prayer can never be answered, his preaching must be false; and it is in vain for us to pray for the presence of our Saviour.

6. This doctrine is also taught in Rev. iii. 20: "Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me." In this text, there are two things worthy of notice. 1. Christ is here represented as standing and knocking at the door of the sinner's heart. And as there are no exceptions given in the text, he must stand at the door of *every* heart that has not yielded to his grace; consequently, his presence must extend to the utmost bounds of the habitable world. Wherever there is an unregenerate soul, there he stands and knocks at the door of his heart; but to do this, he must be omnipresent. 2. For the encouragement of those who hear his voice, and open the door unto him, our Saviour promises in this passage that he will come in unto them, and sup with them. This promise has, doubtless, carried joy to the hearts of thousands. It has fallen upon the ear of the almost despairing sinner as the voice of pardon upon those of the man condemned to die. But deny the omnipresence of our Saviour, and you strip it of all its consoling influence, yea, upon the supposition that he is a finite and limited being, it would be impossible for him to redeem the pledge which he has here given, unless we can suppose that among the many thousands who are now flying to him for mercy, only one yields at the same time.

Our opponents endeavor to evade the force of these arguments, in favor of the omnipresence of our Saviour, by supposing that a being may be in different places at

the same time, without being omnipresent. To give this some show of plausibility, it is said that the Devil is in many places at the same time, and yet no one contends that he is omnipresent. Thus bringing our Saviour, as far as his omnipresence is concerned, down upon a level with the prince of darkness. Mr. Millard has too plainly committed himself upon this subject to be misunderstood. In his True Messiah, p. 155, in reply to Dr. Luckey, he has the following words: "So far would Mr. L. be from maintaining that none but the infinite God can be present in different places at the same time, that he will no doubt acknowledge that even Satan is in many places at once. That this old accuser of the brethren is in many places at the same time, he no doubt believes. If he is willing to admit this, (and I think he will not deny it,) why should he think it impossible for the Son of God to be present at different places with his disciples at the same time, and yet not be the very God himself?"

Why Mr. M. should think that Dr. Luckey, or any other Trinitarian, believes that the Devil is in different places at the same time, I am at a loss to know. It is, however, certain that such a doctrine has never been taught by them. Nor has Mr. M. found it in any of their writings. So far are Trinitarians from admitting that the Devil, or any other created being, occupies more than one place at the same time, that they have universally taught this to be an attribute peculiar to God. It is not so, however, with Mr. M., for, from the above extract, it appears that he believes that the Devil is in many places at the same time; consequently, he must have an omnipresent Devil, or, if he is not willing to admit this, then he must say that Jesus Christ is no more omnipresent than the prince of darkness. Mr. M. probably founds his peculiar doctrine of the omnipresence of the Devil, upon the fact that many persons are subject to temptation at the same period of time. It should, however, be remembered, 1. That the Devil

has many demons under his direction. We know not the number of fallen angels; they may be more than the whole family of man. Therefore, it is possible that men may be tempted in different places at the same time, and yet the Devil not be in more than one place at once.

2. We are not sure that evil spirits may not produce effects which often remain when those spirits are no longer immediately present. We know that a moral principle once imbibed, often produces effects for a long period after the departure of the person from whom it has been imbibed. In view of this fact, and the one above mentioned, it is evident that different men may be tempted at the same time, and still the Devil be in only one place at once; therefore, the idea of his being in different places at the same time, is left without the least shadow of support, and the omnipresence of our Saviour remains untouched. May we not then say of him, that he

"Lives through all life, extends through all extent,
Spreads undivided, operates unspent,
Breathes in our souls, informs our mortal parts,
As full, as perfect, in a hair, as heart;
As full, as perfect, in vile man that mourns,
As the rapt seraph that adores and burns.
To him no high, no low, no great, no small,
He fills, he bounds, connects, and equals all."

VIII. *Christ is omniscient, or infinite in wisdom.* "This cannot be the attribute of a creature, for, though it may be difficult to say how far the knowledge of the highest order of intelligent creatures may be extended, yet is there two kinds of knowledge which God has made peculiar to himself by a peculiar claim. The first is, the perfect knowledge of the thoughts and intents of the heart. 'I the Lord search the heart, I try the reins,' Jeremiah xvii. 10. 'Thou, even thou only,' says Solomon, 'knowest the hearts of all the children of men,' 1

Kings viii. 39. This knowledge is attributed to and was claimed by our Lord, and that without any intimation that it was in consequence of a special revelation, or *supernatural* gift, as in a few instances we see in the Apostles and Prophets, bestowed to answer a particular and temporary purpose. In such instances also, it is to be observed, that the knowledge of the spirits and thoughts of men was obtained in consequence of a *revelation* made to them by Him whose prerogative it is to search the heart. In the case of our Lord, it is, however, not merely said, 'And Jesus *knew their thoughts*,' that he *perceived in his spirit*, that they so reasoned among themselves; but it is referred to as an *attribute* or *original faculty*, and it is, therefore, made use of by St. John, on one occasion, to explain his conduct with reference to certain of his enemies:—'But Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he KNEW ALL MEN, and needed not that any should testify of man; FOR HE KNEW WHAT WAS IN MAN,' John ii. 24, 25. After his exaltation, also, he claims the prerogative in the full style and majesty of the Jehovah of the Old Testament: 'And all the churches shall know that *I am he which* SEARCHETH THE REINS AND THE HEART,'" *(Watson,)* Rev. ii. 23. It is, therefore, certain that our Saviour knows the hearts and tries the reins of the children of men, while Jehovah claims this as his peculiar prerogative; and Solomon, in his address to Deity, says, "Thou, even thou *only*, knowest the hearts of all the children of men:" therefore, Jesus Christ, the Saviour of sinners, must be the omniscient God.

2. "A striking description of the omniscience of Christ is also found in Heb. iv. 12, 13, if we understand it, with most of the ancients, of the hypostatic Word; (Jesus Christ,) to which sense, I think the scope of the passage and context clearly determines it. 'For the WORD OF GOD is quick (living) and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit and of the joints and

marrow, and is a DISCERNER OF THE THOUGHTS AND INTENTS OF THE HEART; neither is there any creature that is not MANIFEST in his sight; for all things are NAKED and OPEN to the eyes of him with whom we have to do.' The reasons for referring this passage rather to Christ, the author of the Gospel, than to the Gospel itself, are, first, that it agrees better with the Apostle's argument. He is warning Christians against the example of ancient Jewish unbelief, and enforces his warning by reminding them, that the Word of God discerns the thoughts and intents of the heart. The argument is obvious, if the *personal* Word is meant; not at all so, if the doctrine of the Gospel be supposed. Secondly, the clauses, 'neither is there any creature that is not manifest in HIS sight,' and, all 'things are naked and open to the eyes of HIM, with whom we have to do,' or '*to whom we must give an account,*' are undoubtedly spoken of a person, and that person our witness and judge. Those, therefore, who think that the Gospel is spoken of in verse 12, represent the Apostle as making a transition from the Gospel to God himself in what follows. This, however, produces a violent break in the argument, for which no grammatical nor contextual reason whatever can be given; and it is evident that the same metaphor extends through both verses. This is taken from the practice of dividing and cutting asunder the bodies of beasts slain for sacrifice, and laying them open for inspection, lest any blemish or unsoundness should lurk within, and render them unfit for the service of God. The dividing asunder of 'the joints and marrow' in the 12th verse, and the being made 'naked and open to the eyes,' in the 13th, are all parts of the same sacrificial and judicial *action*, to which, therefore, we can justly assign but one *agent*. The only reason given for the other interpretation is, that the term Logos is nowhere else used by St. Paul. This can weigh but little against the obvious sense of the passage. St. Luke i. 2, appears to use the term Logos, in a personal

sense, and he uses it but once; and if St. Paul uses it here, and not in his other epistles, this reason may be given, that in other epistles he writes to Jews and Gentiles united in the same churches; here, to Jews alone, among whom we have seen that the Logos was a well-known theological term."—*(Watson.)* It is, therefore, evident that this passage refers to Christ; and of him it affirms, that he is a "*discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart,*" that ALL *things are naked and open to his eyes*, and that there is not any thing that is not manifest in his sight; therefore, he must be infinite in wisdom.

3. As the knowledge of the heart is attributed to Christ, so also is the knowledge of *futurity;* which is another quality so peculiar to Deity, that we find the true God distinguishing himself from all the false divinities of the Heathen by this circumstance alone. "I am God, and there is none like me, *Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done,* saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure," Isaiah xlvi. 9, 10. So certain, however, is it that Christ possessed this knowledge of futurity, and that he was capable of making known future events, that it is said to have been his spirit which inspired the prophets. 1 Pet. i. 9, 10, 11. "Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls: of which salvation the *prophets* have inquired diligently, *who* prophesied of the grace that *should come* unto you: searching what, or what manner of time *the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.*" It is also affirmed, John vi. 64, that "Jesus *knew from the beginning* who they were that believed not, and who should betray him;" and again, it is said, "For Jesus *knew* who should betray him." These passages of holy writ, as well as the numerous predictions which were uttered by our Saviour, many of which have been most literally

and circumstantially fulfilled, prove conclusively that the future is open to his omniscient eye. Therefore, he must be that infinitely wise being, who, by the mouth of the Prophet, makes the following inquiry concerning himself: "To whom will ye liken me, and make me equal, and compare me, that we may be like?" "I am God, and there is none like me, *Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done.*"

In order to evade the force of this argument, it is contended by our opponents, that this knowledge of futurity was possessed by Christ in consequence of a special revelation from God, as in the case of the Prophets. But if this was the fact with regard to the knowledge of our Saviour, why does he not give us some intimation of it? Why does he remain silent upon this important point, while the Prophets are so particular to inform us from whence they derived *their* knowledge of futurity, and while he must have known that this very silence was calculated to mislead us, if this knowledge was not an original attribute of his nature? But instead of giving us to understand that he received this knowledge from any other source, he uniformly speaks of it as proceeding from his own prescience. And so far are the Apostles from teaching that Christ possessed this knowledge in consequence of revelation, that they inform us that it was his Spirit which was in the Prophets inspiring them to foretell future events.

4. The omniscience of Christ is also most clearly taught in Col. ii. 2, 3: "That their hearts might be comforted, being knit together in love, and unto all riches of the full assurance of understanding, to the acknowledgment of the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ, *in whom are hid* ALL *the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.*" Now if the treasures, and *all* the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hid in Christ, as this text plainly declares, he must be infinite in wisdom. Nor is St. Paul the only Apostle of our Saviour

who bears testimony to this important truth; for Peter addresses him in the following impressive language: "*Lord thou knowest all things; thou knowest* that I love thee." Again, in John xvi. 30, his disciples, after having witnessed a display of his wisdom, exclaimed with one voice, "*Now we are* SURE *that thou knowest all things*, and needest not that any man should ask thee: by this we believe that thou camest forth from God." Should it be objected, that Christ no where approves of the honor which is here done him, by his Apostles, I answer, that this is little to the purpose; for the expressions in the above texts declaring that in him are all the treasures of wisdom, and that he knows all things, must be either true or false. If *true*, Jesus must approve of them; for he is truth itself, and they prove the point for which we plead. If they are *false*, they are pregnant with blasphemy; and if so, the honor of God, and the salvation of the Apostles made it necessary that they should have been sharply reproved. What! shall Christ say to Peter, "Get thee behind me, Satan!" when he only endeavored to dissuade him from going up to Jerusalem, there to suffer? and shall his disciples meet with no rebuke from the humble and holy Jesus, when they rob God of his glory and give it to another, by ascribing infinite wisdom, one of the Divine perfections, to a mere creature? There is nothing so precious as the glory of God, it being the ultimate end of all things; consequently, so far as any thing is contrary to it, it must be detestable. But in the passages before us the Apostles not only rob God of his glory, by ascribing one of his perfections to a mere creature, as Jesus Christ must be if he is not God, but if their assertions that Christ knew all things be false, they must have been guilty of *blasphemy*. Therefore both the glory of God and the salvation of the Apostles required that the Saviour should have corrected them, if in an error. But Jesus did not correct them,

therefore they were not mistaken; and Jesus Christ must know all things.

It is, however, urged that the passage above mentioned, declaring that Christ knows all things, cannot prove his omniscience, without proving that Christians are omniscient also; for John says to his brethren, "Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things." 1 John ii. 20. In reply to this, we would say that with the same propriety we might endeavor to disprove the omniscience of the Father. The Bible certainly gives us to understand that God knows all things, but this cannot prove that he does without proving that Christians are infinite in wisdom; for John says to some of them, "But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things." Who does not see that our opponents, in order to maintain their position, have either to deny the wisdom of Deity, or else contend that Christians are equal with him in knowledge? If they attempt to escape from this dilemma by saying that the proposition, "and ye know all things," is limited in the text quoted from 1 John, they then give up the whole force of their argument, founded upon it, against the omniscience of the Saviour. That this proposition is limited in the text from 1 John must be admitted, unless we can suppose that Christians are as wise as God, a doctrine for which our opponents will not contend. But there can be no such reason given for limiting the knowledge of our Saviour; for the orthodox doctrine is that he is God.

Unitarians, however, urge against this ascription of "infinite knowledge to our Lord, Mark xiii. 32: 'But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, *neither the Son*, but the Father only.' The genuineness of the clause 'neither the Son' has been disputed, and is not inserted by Griesbach in his text; there is not, however, sufficient reason for its rejection, though certainly in the parallel passage, Matt. xxiv. 36, 'neither the Son' is not found

'But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels in heaven; but my Father only.' We are then reduced to this—a number of passages explicitly declare that Christ knows all things; there is one which declares that the Son did not know 'the day and the hour' of judgment; again there is a passage which certainly implies that even this period was known to Christ; for St. Paul, 1 Tim. vi. 14, speaking of the 'appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ' as the universal judge, immediately adds, 'which in *his own times* shall show who is the blessed and only potentate,' &c. The day of judgment is called '*his own times*,' or '*his own season*,' which, in its obvious sense, means the season he has himself fixed, since a certain manifestation of himself is in its fullness reserved by him to that period. As 'the times and the seasons,' also, are said, in another place, to be in the Father's 'own power;' so by an equivalent phrase, they are here said to be in the power of the Son, because they are '*his own times*.' Doubtless, then, he knew 'the day and the hour of judgment.' Now, certainly, no such glaring and direct contradiction can exist in the word of truth, as that our Lord should know the day of judgment, and, at the same time, and in the same sense, not know it. Either, therefore, the passage in Mark must admit of an interpretation which will make it consistent with other passages which clearly affirm our Lord's knowledge of all things, and consequently of this great day, or these passages must submit to such an interpretation as will bring them into accordance with that in Mark. It cannot, however, be in the nature of things that texts, which clearly predicate an infinite knowledge, should be interpreted to mean a finite and partial knowledge, and this attempt would only establish a contradiction between the text and the comment. Their interpretation is imperative upon us; but the text in Mark is capable of an interpretation which involves no contradiction or absurdity whatever, and which makes it accord with the

rest of the Scripture testimony on this subject." *(Watson.)* This interpretation, is found in the fact that the clause in the above text, "neither the Son," refers exclusively to the human nature of the Lord; and "it must be granted, that as *man* he did not know beyond the capacities of human and finite understanding; and not what he knew as GOD: He could not be supposed to know in this respect things not knowable by *man*, any otherwise than as the Divine nature and wisdom thought fit to communicate and impart such knowledge to him.

"Therefore CHRIST may be said, with respect to his human nature and finite understanding, not to know the precise time, the day and hour of some future events;" while, as God, in his Divine nature, he was infinite in knowledge.

"It is, indeed, objected by Unitarians, that this interpretation of Mark xiii. 32, charges our Saviour, if not with direct falsehood, at least with criminal evasion; since he could not say, with truth and sincerity, that he was ignorant of the day, if he knew it in any capacity; as it cannot be denied that man is immortal, so long as he is, in any respect, immortal. The answer to this is, that as it may truly be said of the *body* of man, that it is not immortal, though the *soul* is; so it may, with equal truth, be said, that the *Son of Man* was ignorant of some things, though the *Son of God* knew every thing. It is not, then, inconsistent with truth and sincerity for our Lord to deny that he knew what he really did know in one capacity, while he was ignorant of it in another. Thus, in one place he says, 'Now I am no more in the world,' John xvii. 11; and in another, 'Ye have the poor always with you; but me ye have not always,' Matt. xxvi. 11; yet on another occasion, he says, 'Lo, I am with you always,' Matt. xxviii. 20; and again, 'If a man love me, my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him,' John xiv. 23. From hence we see that our

Lord might, without any breach of sincerity, deny that of himself, considered in one capacity, which he could not have denied in another. There was no equivocation in his denying the knowledge of 'that day and that hour,' since, with respect to his human nature, it was most true; and that he designed it to refer alone to his human nature, is probable, because he does not say the *Son of God* was ignorant of that day, but the *Son*, meaning the *Son of man*, as appears from the context, (Matthew xxiv. 37, 39; Mark xiii. 26, 34.) Thus Mark xiii. 32, which, at first sight, may seem to favor the Unitarian hypothesis, is capable of a rational and unforced interpretation, consistently with the orthodox faith.—*Holden.*

And that this interpretation is correct, is evident from the fact that it is the only one which will reconcile the different passages of Scripture relative to our Saviour's knowledge; for in one place it is said that he knows all things, while in the text under consideration he is said to be ignorant of the day of Judgment. These passages, on the principles of our opponents, which deny that one of them refers to his Divine and the other to his human nature, are directly opposed to and contradict each other; and if the Bible contradicts itself, it cannot be true. Unitarians must, therefore, admit the correctness of the above interpretation, or deny that the Scriptures were given by Divine inspiration; and if the Scriptures are not Divinely inspired, why do they quote them in defence of their doctrines?

IX. *Christ is omnipotent.* Omnipotent power, according to Grundy, who was a noted Unitarian, is "power of control over all things." In Phil. iii. 21, the Apostle, speaking of Christ, says, "Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself.' It is, therefore, evident that Christ is omnipotent, even taking an Unitarian definition of omnipotence; for it is express-

ly said that he is able to subdue all things unto himself; consequently, he must have power of control over all things, which Mr. G. says is omnipotence.

This corresponds with Isaiah ix. 5: "His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the *Mighty God.*" The original word here rendered *mighty,* not only conveys an idea of simple power and strength, but of *conquering* strength and prevailing power. Thus Christ is not only *mighty* in his energies, but irresistably efficacious and *almighty.* But it is said that the person here spoken of was born—that he was a son given; from which our opponents argue that he cannot be almighty: for an almighty being cannot, without the grossest impiety, be said to be either a child born or a son given. It should, however, be remembered, that the Prophet is here speaking of both the human and Divine nature of Jesus Christ. "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given." These words unquestionably refer to the human nature in which he was to make his future appearance. But the following words, "his name shall be called the Mighty God," evidently refer to the Divine nature.

That this is a correct view of the subject, is evident from the fact that it is the only view that can be taken which will reconcile the different parts of the text. While if we deny that the Prophet refers both to the human and Divine nature of our Lord, we make one clause of the text contradict the other; thereby destroying the truth of the Sacred Scriptures.

It is, however, contended that this is only a prophecy setting forth the impiety of those who should presume to call our Saviour by this improper name. But if it can be shown that he is declared to be almighty by other inspired writers, it is presumed that it will clear those who believe in his omnipotence from the charge of impiety, prove that he is almighty, and establish his Divinity.

In Rev. i. 8, we find the following words of the Sa-

viour: "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the *Almighty*." This text is not presented to us in the language of prophecy, as the one quoted from Isaiah, but it is a solemn description of the character of Christ in the present tense. A description given by Christ himself, while holding converse with his servant John in the Island of Patmos, and in this sublime description of his own character, he declares himself to be *Almighty*.

Isaiah was directed to prophecy in the name of the Lord, saying, "All flesh shall know that I the Lord am thy Saviour and thy Redeemer, the Mighty One of Jacob," Isaiah xlix. 26. But, Jesus Christ is the Saviour and Redeemer; therefore, he is both Jehovah and the *Mighty* One of Jacob, or the *Almighty*. The Psalmist, also, when his heart indited a good matter, and he was speaking of the things touching the king, calls upon him as the Mighty One. "Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O *most Mighty*, with thy glory and thy majesty." Again, he says of him in this enraptured language, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre," Psalms xlv. 1—6. These very words, so expressive of omnipotence and absolute Divinity, are, by St. Paul, in the first chapter of Hebrews, applied to Christ; therefore, we cannot be mistaken in asserting that he is *Almighty*.

2. Nor was our Saviour mighty in name or word only, but in deed and in truth. The miracles which were wrought by him, bear testimony to his omnipotence. All, who are, in the least, acquainted with the history of his life, as given by the evangelists, know that at his word the dumb was made to speak, the deaf to hear, and the blind to see; the lame forgot his infirmities, and leaped for joy; the sick man rose from his bed in perfect soundness and sang his praise. The elements were also under his control. At his command the wind ceased, and there was a great calm. His voice, also, pene-

trated the darkness of the tomb, and roused its inmates from the sleep of death: called their bodies from the silent grave, and their spirits from the eternal world. These works are of such a stupenduous nature, that they prove, beyond all contradiction, that Christ is Almighty: for it certainly required omnipotent power in order to their performance. To say, that these miracles were wrought by any thing less than omnipotent power, is to say that they were not wrought by the power of God, unless we can suppose that God has a power which is not omnipotent. But, if God has a power which is not almighty, he must have one attribute which is not infinite, and must, therefore, fail of being an infinite being. If, however, these were not wrought by Almighty power, or by the power of God, they fail of proving the Divine origin of the Christian religion, which is the very end for which they were wrought.

But, to destroy the force of this argument, we are told, that the Apostles performed the same miracles, and must therefore possess the same power, and if the possessing this power, and the performing these works, prove that Christ is almighty, the Apostles must be almighty also.

In reply to this, it is sufficient to remind the reader, that the apostles did not perform these miracles, like their Divine master, in their own name; their language is, in the name of Jesus of Nazareth, I say unto thee arise and walk. This, therefore, destroys the force of the above objection, and at the same time, if possible, it increases the strength of the argument in favor of the position that Jesus Christ is almighty. For it shows, conclusively, that he is the source from which the Apostles derived the power by which they were enabled to do these miracles, and that it was in his name, and by his power, that they performed them.

3. That Christ is almighty, is also evident from the fact that he is the creator of all things. John i. 3: "All things were made by him; and without him was

not any thing made that was made." And, Col. i. 15, 16, 17: "Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature: for by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; *all things were created by him, and for him;* and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." Now, if he created *all things*, he not only created the earth in its present form, with all its furniture, from the smallest spire of grass, which is trodden unheeded beneath our feet, up to the stately oak, which has braved the tempest of a hundred years, and from the small animalculæ, which hides itself on the surface of the polished marble, up to the huge mammoth, whose footsteps shook the earth, together with that mighty mass of intellect which has fluttered in the human bosom since the formation of man. But, also, those numerous worlds and systems of worlds which are spread out through the immensity of space, to such an amazing distance, that it is probable that there are suns in the centre of systems of worlds whose light has not reached us since the first dawn of time, notwithstanding light flies swifter than the speed of a cannon ball. Who, then, wonders that the Psalmist should exclaim, "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth his handiwork." Or that Milton, while meditating on the wonders of creation, should say, "These are thy work, parent of good, *Almighty* thine, this universal frame." But his creative power does not stop here. He also created all the hosts of the upper sanctuary, from the spirit of an humble Lazarus, up to the tallest seraph who stands before the throne. Now, let me inquire, if all this was done without omnipotent power; such a hypothesis is absurd, and carries its own refutation on its very front. There are those, however, who deny that omnipotence was exerted in the work of creation. This position was taken in a public debate in which the writer of these pages

and the Rev. John Power, were called upon to defend the orthodox doctrine against the cavils of two preachers of that class of Unitarians who claim to be called by the name of Christians. The argument which was then advanced to support the position that omnipotent power was not exerted in the work of creation, was, that if omnipotence was exerted in creation, the creation must be infinite, for every effect must be equal to its cause.

To which Mr. Power replied, in his usual conclusive manner, that if the argument was sound, it would either prove that God is not an infinite being, or that the creation is indeed infinite. For it is expressly declared, in Gen. i. 1, that "in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth;" therefore, God is the cause, and if an infinite cause must necessarily produce an infinite effect, it follows that if God is infinite, every thing which he has created must be infinite also; consequently, we have not only an infinite heaven, and an infinite earth, but even infinite bugs, bats, and moles. But these are not infinite; therefore, God is not an infinite being; that is, if an infinite cause must produce an infinite effect. The position was then taken, that although God, the creator, was infinite, yet he did not exert his infinite power in creation. In reply to this, it was argued, that if this was the fact, then, as has been remarked on the subject of miracles, God has a power which is not infinite, and, therefore, must be a finite being; for the moment we attach any thing to him which is not infinite, we strip him of his infinity. We therefore see that the above arguments of our opponents, like many others which have been noticed, would, if sound, annihilate Deity, and leave the Universe without a moral governor.

But it is objected that Christ created officially, or by delegation. I answer, this is impossible; for, as creation requires absolute and unlimited power or omnipo-

tence, there can be but *one* Creator. See this objection answered on page 85.

4. We may now sum up the Scriptural argument in favor of the Divine attributes being ascribed by the inspired penmen to our Saviour, with two of his own remarkable declarations. The first is John v. 19: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise." Does the Father exert omnipotent power, or exercise infinite wisdom, so does the Son. Does the Father extend through illimitable space, and fill the universe with his presence—does he pursue the same changeless course through the annals of eternity, the same may be said of Jesus Christ; for "whatsoever the Father doeth, these doeth the Son likewise." Again, what the Father does is acknowledged by all to be the work of God, and proper to no creature; Jesus does whatsoever the Father does, therefore he must possess the same attributes, and be clothed with the same nature. Again, the Son can do nothing but what he sees the Father do. But he never sees the Father err or change, therefore he can never err or change, but must be immutable; and if immutable, he must be God; for God is the only immutable being.

But it is said, "The Son can do nothing of himself;" and from this it is argued that he is inferior to the Father. If, however, those who make this objection would read the text with a little more care they would see the fallacy of their argument. It is not said that the Son can do nothing of himself, without any qualifying term, but the Son can do nothing of himself *but what he seeth the Father do;* from which it clearly follows that he *can* do whatever he sees the Father do. But it is manifestly impossible for any created being to do whatever God does. Jesus Christ *does*, therefore he is no created being, but absolutely God, possessing the same nature and attributes of the Father.

We are, however, perfectly willing to admit that Christ can do nothing of himself alone. But it by no means follows that he is inferior to the Father, any more than that the Father is inferior to the Son; for the Father can do nothing without the Son. This is evident from the following clause in the text: "Whatsoever he doeth, these doeth the Son likewise;" showing that the Son is present with the Father in all his works.

The reason why the Son can do nothing of himself, undoubtedly is, that he is so intimately connected with the Father that neither of them can act in a separate and independent manner. Therefore Christ very justly says, on the one hand, that "the Son can do nothing of himself," and on the other, that "whatsoever the Father doeth, these doeth the Son likewise;" thus showing the indissoluble union that exists between them, which proves both the doctrine of the Trinity and Divinity of Christ.

A similar declaration of the Saviour is to be found in John xvi. 15: "All things that the Father hath *are mine*; therefore said I, he shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you." Here the Saviour, in the plainest possible manner, gives us to understand that he possesses all that belongs to the Father. Is, then, the Father in the possession of infinite attributes? Is he eternal, omnipotent, omniscient, immutable, and omnipresent? If so, then Jesus Christ must possess all these attributes; for he expressly says, "All the Father hath are mine."

We think that we have now established, to the satisfaction of every unprejudiced mind, the position that Jesus Christ possesses the peculiar attributes of Deity, such as, eternal existence, omnipotent power, and infinite wisdom; that he is immutable in his nature, and that he fills immensity with his presence. Now let us inquire what are the Scripture views of God. Do not they represent him to us as a being possessing these very attributes which we have proved was possessed by Christ? And were an Arian, or Socinian, or any of

tence, there can be but *one* Creator. See this objection answered on page 85.

4. We may now sum up the Scriptural argument in favor of the Divine attributes being ascribed by the inspired penmen to our Saviour, with two of his own remarkable declarations. The first is John v. 19: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise." Does the Father exert omnipotent power, or exercise infinite wisdom, so does the Son. Does the Father extend through illimitable space, and fill the universe with his presence—does he pursue the same changeless course through the annals of eternity, the same may be said of Jesus Christ; for "whatsoever the Father doeth, these doeth the Son likewise." Again, what the Father does is acknowledged by all to be the work of God, and proper to no creature; Jesus does whatsoever the Father does, therefore he must possess the same attributes, and be clothed with the same nature. Again, the Son can do nothing but what he sees the Father do. But he never sees the Father err or change, therefore he can never err or change, but must be immutable; and if immutable, he must be God; for God is the only immutable being.

But it is said, "The Son can do nothing of himself;" and from this it is argued that he is inferior to the Father. If, however, those who make this objection would read the text with a little more care they would see the fallacy of their argument. It is not said that the Son can do nothing of himself, without any qualifying term, but the Son can do nothing of himself *but what he seeth the Father do*; from which it clearly follows that he *can* do whatever he sees the Father do. But it is manifestly impossible for any created being to do whatever God does. Jesus Christ *does*, therefore he is no created being, but absolutely God, possessing the same nature and attributes of the Father.

We are, however, perfectly willing to admit that Christ can do nothing of himself alone. But it by no means follows that he is inferior to the Father, any more than that the Father is inferior to the Son; for the Father can do nothing without the Son. This is evident from the following clause in the text: "Whatsoever he doeth, these doeth the Son likewise;" showing that the Son is present with the Father in all his works.

The reason why the Son can do nothing of himself, undoubtedly is, that he is so intimately connected with the Father that neither of them can act in a separate and independent manner. Therefore Christ very justly says, on the one hand, that "the Son can do nothing of himself," and on the other, that "whatsoever the Father doeth, these doeth the Son likewise;" thus showing the indissoluble union that exists between them, which proves both the doctrine of the Trinity and Divinity of Christ.

A similar declaration of the Saviour is to be found in John xvi. 15: "All things that the Father hath *are mine;* therefore said I, he shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you." Here the Saviour, in the plainest possible manner, gives us to understand that he possesses all that belongs to the Father. Is, then, the Father in the possession of infinite attributes? Is he eternal, omnipotent, omniscient, immutable, and omnipresent? If so, then Jesus Christ must possess all these attributes; for he expressly says, "All the Father hath are mine."

We think that we have now established, to the satisfaction of every unprejudiced mind, the position that Jesus Christ possesses the peculiar attributes of Deity, such as, eternal existence, omnipotent power, and infinite wisdom; that he is immutable in his nature, and that he fills immensity with his presence. Now let us inquire what are the Scripture views of God. Do not they represent him to us as a being possessing these very attributes which we have proved was possessed by Christ? And were an Arian, or Socinian, or any of

those modern Semi-Arians, who claim to be distinguished by the name of Christians, called upon to describe the character or being of God, would they not readily say that he is an eternal, omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent being? Undoubtedly they would; for what idea have we of God aside from his attributes? "The complex idea," says Mr. Hare, "which we have of any being is the aggregate of our ideas of its known properties." Thus man is known by possessing the distinguishing properties which belong to man. In like manner, God is known to us as possessing the peculiar attributes which distinguish him from all other beings. These attributes are, eternal existence, omnipotent power, infinite wisdom, and unbounded presence. Strip him of these peculiar and distinguishing properties or attributes, and he is no longer God. And any being who possesses these attributes of Deity must be God. Jesus Christ possesses them, as we have just proved, therefore he must be God.

Those who deny the essential Divinity of Christ, vainly endeavor to evade the force of the above reasoning, by saying that he possessed these attributes by delegation from the Father. But before this theory can be established, there are several insurmountable difficulties to be removed.

1. If Christ possessed these attributes by delegation from the Father, then the Father is no longer God; for it is evident that to be God, he must possess all the distinguishing attributes of God. But he cannot now possess them if he has given them all to Christ, therefore it is evident, upon the above supposition, that he is no longer God. Thus we see that the system which would give Christ these attributes by delegation from the Father, robs the Father of all his glory—strips him of his eternal power and Godhead—divests him of all his attributes—drives him from his throne—and reduces him to a level with his creatures; while, at the same time, a creature (for if Christ is not God, he is a creature)

ascends the throne—is invested with all the Divine attributes—clothed with all the plenitude of omnipotent power—and sways the sceptre of the universe.

Such are the awful conclusions to which this system of delegation necessarily drives us. And will men, yea, men who profess to be Christian ministers, amidst all the religious light and glory of the nineteenth century, and with the Bible in their hands, stand up in its defence?

But to render it the more plausible, and to strip it of some of its more glaring absurdities, it is sometimes said that the Father has delegated only a part of his attributes to the Son—such as his omnipotent power—while he retains the rest himself. But this, instead of removing any of the difficulties which attend the theory of those modern divines who advocate this system of delegation, only serves to sink them still deeper in confusion, and to develop still clearer the absurdity of their cause; for if the Father has given a part of his attributes to the Son, it is evident that he is left imperfect, and must, therefore, cease to be God; for to be God, he must be perfect, and in the entire possession of each and every attribute which belongs to God. But if he has given part of his essential attributes away to Christ, it is evident that he cannot now possess them all; for it would be absurd to suppose that he could give away any of his attributes, and at the same time retain them all himself. It is, therefore, evident that, if the idea that the Father has given away a part of the essential attributes of his nature be correct, the Father must be imperfect; and if imperfect, he is not God, for God is a perfect being. We therefore see that this theory also robs the Father, as well as the one which goes before it. But it not only robs the Father, but also the Son; for if he has only a part of the Divine attributes, it is evident that he too is an imperfect and finite being: consequently, according to our opponents, we are left without a God. For, according to their theory, the Father has

those modern Semi-Arians, who claim to be distinguished by the name of Christians, called upon to describe the character or being of God, would they not readily say that he is an eternal, omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent being? Undoubtedly they would; for what idea have we of God aside from his attributes? "The complex idea," says Mr. Hare, "which we have of any being is the aggregate of our ideas of its known properties." Thus man is known by possessing the distinguishing properties which belong to man. In like manner, God is known to us as possessing the peculiar attributes which distinguish him from all other beings. These attributes are, eternal existence, omnipotent power, infinite wisdom, and unbounded presence. Strip him of these peculiar and distinguishing properties or attributes, and he is no longer God. And any being who possesses these attributes of Deity must be God. Jesus Christ possesses them, as we have just proved, therefore he must be God.

Those who deny the essential Divinity of Christ, vainly endeavor to evade the force of the above reasoning, by saying that he possessed these attributes by delegation from the Father. But before this theory can be established, there are several insurmountable difficulties to be removed.

1. If Christ possessed these attributes by delegation from the Father, then the Father is no longer God; for it is evident that to be God, he must possess all the distinguishing attributes of God. But he cannot now possess them if he has given them all to Christ, therefore it is evident, upon the above supposition, that he is no longer God. Thus we see that the system which would give Christ these attributes by delegation from the Father, robs the Father of all his glory—strips him of his eternal power and Godhead—divests him of all his attributes—drives him from his throne—and reduces him to a level with his creatures; while, at the same time, a creature (for if Christ is not God, he is a creature)

ascends the throne—is invested with all the Divine attributes—clothed with all the plenitude of omnipotent power—and sways the sceptre of the universe.

Such are the awful conclusions to which this system of delegation necessarily drives us. And will men, yea, men who profess to be Christian ministers, amidst all the religious light and glory of the nineteenth century, and with the Bible in their hands, stand up in its defence?

But to render it the more plausible, and to strip it of some of its more glaring absurdities, it is sometimes said that the Father has delegated only a part of his attributes to the Son—such as his omnipotent power—while he retains the rest himself. But this, instead of removing any of the difficulties which attend the theory of those modern divines who advocate this system of delegation, only serves to sink them still deeper in confusion, and to develop still clearer the absurdity of their cause; for if the Father has given a part of his attributes to the Son, it is evident that he is left imperfect, and must, therefore, cease to be God; for to be God, he must be perfect, and in the entire possession of each and every attribute which belongs to God. But if he has given part of his essential attributes away to Christ, it is evident that he cannot now possess them all; for it would be absurd to suppose that he could give away any of his attributes, and at the same time retain them all himself. It is, therefore, evident that, if the idea that the Father has given away a part of the essential attributes of his nature be correct, the Father must be imperfect; and if imperfect, he is not God, for God is a perfect being. We therefore see that this theory also robs the Father, as well as the one which goes before it. But it not only robs the Father, but also the Son; for if he has only a part of the Divine attributes, it is evident that he too is an imperfect and finite being: consequently, according to our opponents, we are left without a God. For, according to their theory, the Father has

given away a part of his attributes, therefore he is imperfect; Jesus Christ has received but a part of them, therefore he is imperfect; and if the Father and the Son are both imperfect, neither of them can be God; for, as above remarked, God is a perfect being; and if neither the Father nor the Son be God, and the Holy Ghost is nothing but an attribute, or, what is worse, an unintelligent agent, then we are left without a God, consequently without a moral governor of the universe. May we not, then, apply to the advocates of this system of delegation the following words of the poet:

"They labored hard; O, labor worse than nought!
And toiled with dark and crooked reasoning,
To make the fair and lovely earth, which dwelt
In sight of heaven, a cold, and fatherless,
Forsaken thing, that wandered on, forlorn,
Undestined, uncompassioned, unupheld;
A vapor eddying in the whirl of chance,
And soon to vanish everlastingly."

But we are told, in the next place, that, notwithstanding the Father has given a part or all of his attributes to Jesus Christ, he is still perfect, because he can give them away, and at the same time retain them all himself. In answer to this, I would say, in the first place, that this is a contradiction in terms. It is manifestly absurd to suppose that God could give any of his attributes to a creature, however high that creature might stand in the scale of being; and much more absurd to suppose that he could give them away, and at the same time retain them all himself.

But allowing all that the advocates of this theory contend for, grant that the Father has delegated all of his attributes to his Son, and still retains them all himself, still there is another difficulty to be removed, a difficulty which no one who denies the Divinity of Christ can possibly surmount, and one which effectually destroys this system of delegation. If, as the advocates

of this theory contend, the Father has delegated his attributes to Jesus Christ, and at the same time retains them all himself, and the doctrine of the Trinity be not true—if, as our opponents contend, Jesus Christ does not exist in the Godhead with the Father, but is a distinct and separate being, then it must follow that there are two Gods: for there are two separate and independent beings, each perfect in his nature, possessing all the distinguishing attributes of the Divine Being. But the Scripture doctrine is, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord;" "I am the Lord, and there is none else; there is no God besides me." We are, therefore, compelled to reject this theory that Christ possessed the Divine attributes by delegation, as unscriptural and false.

But the Divine attributes cannot be possesed without the Divine nature. "To men," says Hare, "who are but finite beings, God can give a beginning, dependent, finite, and stable existence;" and the same may be said of all created beings. "He can make them knowing, wise and powerful. But (with reverence) he cannot give to them his infinite perfections. Their minds are finite, and incapable of infinitude. If Jesus Christ was a man or some super-angelic being, however highly exalted, he could not possess the Divine perfections; because, if he is anything less than God, he must be a finite being. To possess the infinite perfections of Deity, he must possess his infinite nature. Can a being who began to exist be without beginning," or from everlasting? "Can a being who is necessarily limited be omnipresent? Can any thing less than an infinite mind know all things? Or can any thing but an uncontrollable and all-controlling mind be omnipotent? or anything but an all perfect mind be immutable? There is an infinite distance between God and the greatest of his creatures. To talk, therefore, of investing a creature with infinite attributes, would be as preposterous as to talk of suspending a world upon an egg shell

against the power of gravity in the solar system. But Jesus Christ possesses these infinite attributes of Deity, therefore can be no creature, but truly a Divine being, for there can be no Divinity more proper than that which possesses Divine perfections.

When Unitarians are not immediately engaged in impugning the Divinity of the Saviour, they can perceive the truth of these remarks. Thus, Mr. Grundy, after enumerating the *supposed* attributes of the Devil, says, "These attributes are all Divine, and if there actually be a being possessing these attributes, that being ought to be a Deity."

There is, however, one passage of sacred writ which is thought by our opponents to favor their views; this is Matt. xxviii. 18: "All power is given unto me in heaven and earth." But this text, instead of aiding Unitarians in their efforts to destroy the doctrine of the supreme Deity of Christ, is a strong argument in its defence. For if *all* power in heaven and earth is given to him, he must be in the possession of all power, and if in the possession of *all power*, there can be no power which he does not possess; consequently, he must be almighty, and if almighty he must be God, for God is the only almighty being. And if he is God, or a being possessing almighty power, he must exist with the Father and Holy Spirit in the undivided Trinity, and with them constitute but one being—one supreme Jehovah. If this be not admitted, then there must be two separate and independent beings, each in the possession of almighty power; therefore, neither of them can be supreme, for a supreme being is one whose power excells all others. And if neither of them are supreme, then neither of them can be God, for God is a supreme being.

The Rev. Mr. Harmon, who wrote in defence of the Trinity, in opposition to Mr. Millard, author of the True Messiah, a work highly esteemed by our opponents, thus remarks on the passage under consideration: "If

Jesus Christ was not the true God, and all power was given into his hands, then he possessed all the powers of the self-existent God. According to Mr. M.'s notion," that Christ is not God, "he must either have possessed it alone and left the Father destitute of all power, or there were two self-existent Gods at the same time." To which Mr. Millard answers, "Is it possible that Mr. H. is so short-sighted as to suppose his readers will not see that he is raising his objections against Scripture? Christ said, 'all power is given unto me in heaven and in earth,' and Mr. H. intimates that this cannot be, or it would leave the Father without any power, or suppose there were two self-existent Gods at the same time. It is to be hoped he will settle this controversy with the Son of God, before he meets him in judgment."

Although Mr. Millard so severely censures Mr. Harmon in the above quotation, yet, in the very next paragraph, he is guilty of the same offence. He says, while speaking of the passage above quoted, "Relative to the extent of power given to Christ, it is highly probable to me, that it was all power in heaven and earth, relating to his kingdom or church." May we not then inquire of him, as he does of Mr. Harmon, is it possible that he is so short-sighted as to suppose his readers will not see he is raising his objections against Scripture, and not against Mr. H. or any other Trinitarian? Christ said *all* power is given unto him in heaven and in earth, and Mr. M. intimates that this is not so, and limits his power to the government of his Church, thus contradicting the Saviour. "It is to be hoped that he will settle this controversy with the Son of God, before he meets him in judgment."

But if our opponents believe the power here alluded to is but a limited power, why is this passage quoted to prove that Christ possesses omnipotent power by delegation from the Father? Or why is it brought forward to show that Trinitarians raise their objections against Scripture, when they object to this system of delega-

tion? If, as Mr. Millard says, this power extends only to the church, it certainly must be a limited power, and therefore might have been given to his human nature, while in his Divine nature he received nothing. And if the text includes *all* power, we see no difficulty in making this application of it. "For *in him dwelt all the fullness* of the *Godhead* bodily." "God was *in* Christ" imparting omnipotent power to the humanity in a similar manner to that in which the soul of men imparts energy to the body. But if all power was given to Christ as a man, our opponents inquire with much triumph, why cannot it be given to any other man? The reason is obvious. In no other man or created being does this fullness of the Godhead dwell. I, however, wish the reader to remember, that those who deny the supreme Deity of Christ, do not believe that the power referred to in the text is omnipotent power; consequently, their theory that Christ possessed this or any other attribute by delegation from his Father, can derive no support from this passage. The position, then, which we have taken, that Christ possessed all the Divine attributes as the inherent attributes of his own nature, remains untouched. Being supported by numerous and overwhelming arguments, it effectually destroys the Unitarian hypothesis and establishes the supreme Divinity of our blessed Saviour, beyond all possibility of contradiction.

X. Christ is an object of religious worship, and therefore must be God, for our Saviour says, "thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." "Instances of falling down at the feet of Jesus and worshipping him are so frequent in the Gospel, that it is not necessary to select the instances which are so familiar; and though we allow that the word worship is sometimes used to express that lowly reverence with which, in the East, it has been always customary to salute persons considered as greatly superior, and especially rulers and sovereigns, it is yet the same word

which, in a great number of instances, is used to express the worship of the Supreme GOD. We are, then, to collect the intention of the act of worship, whether designed as a token of profound civil respect, or of real and Divine adoration, from the circumstances of the instances on record. When a leper comes and 'WORSHIPS' Christ, professing to believe that he had the power of healing diseases, and that in himself, which power he could exercise at his will, all which he expresses by saying, 'Lord, if thou WILT, thou CANST make me clean,' we see a Jew retaining that faith of the Jewish church in its purity which had been corrupted among so many of his nation, that the Messiah was to be a Divine Person; and, viewing our Lord under that character, he regarded his miraculous powers as original and personal, and so hesitated not to worship him. Here, then, is a case in which the circumstances clearly show that the worship was religious and supreme. When the man who had been cured of blindness by Jesus, and who had defended his *prophetic* character before the council, before he knew that he had a higher character than that of a *prophet*, was met in private by Jesus, and instructed in the additional fact, that he was 'THE SON OF GOD,' he worshipped him. 'Jesus heard, that they had cast him out, and when he had found him, he said unto him, Dost thou believe on the Son of God? He answered and said, Who is he, Lord, that I might believe on him? And Jesus said unto him, Thou hast both seen him, and it is he that talketh with thee. And he said, Lord, I believe; and he WORSHIPPED him:'—worshipped him, be it observed, under his character 'Son of God,' a title which was regarded by the Jews as implying actual Divinity, and which the man understood to raise Jesus far above the rank of a mere prophet. The worship paid by this man must, therefore, in its intention, have been supreme, for it was offered to an acknowledged Divine Person, the Son of God. When the disciples, fully yielding to the demonstration of our

Lord's Messiahship, arising out of a series of splendid miracles, recognised him *also* under his personal character, 'they came and worshipped him, saying, Of a truth thou art the Son of GOD!' Matt. xiv. 33. When Peter, upon the miraculous draught of fishes, 'fell at his feet,' and said, 'Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord,' these expressions themselves mark as strongly the awe and apprehension which is produced in the breast of a sinful man, when he feels himself in the presence of Divinity itself, as when Isaiah exclaims, in his vision of the Divine glory, 'Wo is me, for I am undone, for I am a man of unclean lips, and dwell among a people of unclean lips, for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of Hosts.'

"But to proceed with instances of worship subsequent to our Lord's resurrection and ascension: 'He was parted from them, and carried up into heaven, and they WORSHIPPED him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy,' Luke xxiv. 51, 52. Here the act must necessarily have been one of Divine adoration, since it was performed *after* 'he was parted from them,' and cannot be resolved into the customary token of *personal* respect paid to superiors. This was always done in the *presence* of the superior; never by the Jews in his absence.

"When the Apostles were assembled to fill up the place of Judas, the lots being prepared, they pray, 'Thou, Lord, who knowest the hearts of all men, show whether of these men thou hast chosen.' That this prayer is addressed to Christ is clear, from its being his special prerogative to choose his own disciples, who, therefore, styled themselves 'Apostles,' not of the Father, but 'of Jesus Christ.' Here, then, is a direct act of worship, because an act of prayer; and our Lord is addressed as he who 'knows the hearts of all men.' Nor is this more than he himself claims in the Revelation, 'And all the churches shall know that I am he that searcheth the reins and the heart.'

"When Stephen, the protomartyr, was stoned, the

writer of the Acts of the Apostles records two instances of prayer offered to our Lord by this man 'full of the Holy Ghost,' and therefore, according to this declaration, under Divine inspiration. 'LORD JESUS! RECEIVE MY SPIRIT!' 'LORD, LAY NOT THIS SIN TO THEIR CHARGE!' In the former he acknowledges Christ to be the disposer of the eternal states of men: in the latter, he acknowledges him to be the governor and judge of men, having power to remit, pass by, or visit their sins. All these are manifestly Divine acts, which sufficiently show that St. Stephen addressed his prayers to Christ as GOD."

Unitarians, however, tell us that the case of Stephen is an inconsiderable instance, and therefore so much stress ought not to be laid upon it. But why is it inconsiderable? Is it because it was only an ejaculation? Ejaculations are often prayers of the most fervid kind; the most expressive of self-abasement and adoration. Is it for its brevity that it is inconsiderable? What, then, is the precise length of words which is requisite to make a prayer an act of worship? Was this petition preferred on an occasion of distress, on which a Divinity might be naturally invoked? Was it a petition for a succour which none but a Divinity could grant? If this was the case, it was surely an act of worship. Is the situation of the worshipper the circumstance which lessens the authority of his example? They suppose, perhaps, some consternation of his faculties, arising from distress and fear. The history justifies no such supposition. It describes the utterance of the final prayer, as a deliberate act of one who knew his situation, and possessed his understanding. After praying for himself, he kneels down to pray for his persecutors: and such was the composure with which he died, although the manner of his death was the most tumultuous and terrifying, that, as if he had expired quietly upon his bed, the sacred historian says, that "he fell asleep." If Unitarians, therefore, would insinuate, that St. Stephen was

not himself, when he sent forth this short ejaculatory address to Christ, the history refutes them. If he was himself, they cannot justify his prayer to Christ, while they deny that Christ is God, upon any principle that might not equally justify men in praying to the blessed Stephen. If St. Stephen, in the full possession of his faculties, prayed to him who is no God, why do we reproach the Romanist, when he chants the litany of his saints?

"St. Paul also prays to Christ, conjointly with the Father, in behalf of the Thessalonians. 'Now our LORD JESUS CHRIST HIMSELF, and God, even our Father, which hath loved us, and hath given us everlasting consolation, and good hope through grace, *comfort your hearts, and establish you in every good work*,' 2 Thess. ii. 16, 17. In like manner he invokes our Lord to grant his spiritual presence to Timothy: 'The Lord Jesus be with thy spirit,' 2 Tim. iv. 22. The invoking of Christ is, indeed, adduced by St. Paul as a distinctive characteristic of Christians, so that among all the primitive churches this practice must have been universal. 'Unto the church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all that IN EVERY PLACE CALL UPON THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST our Lord, both theirs and ours,' 1 Cor. i. 2. 'It appears, from the expression here and elsewhere used, that to *invocate the name* of our Lord Jesus Christ was a practice characterizing and distinguishing Christians from infidels.'—*(Dr. Benson.)* Thus St. Paul is said, before his conversion, to have had 'authority from the chief priests to bind all THAT CALL UPON THY NAME.' In the Revelation, too, we find St. John worshipping Christ, 'falling at his feet as one dead.' St. Paul also declares 'that at the name of Jesus EVERY KNEE shall bow,' which, in Scripture language, signifies an act of religious worship. 'For this cause I *bow my knees* to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.'

But this homage and adoration of Christ is not con-

fined to men; it is practised among heavenly beings. "And again, when he bringeth in the first-begotten into the world, he saith, And LET ALL THE ANGELS OF GOD WORSHIP HIM." The Apostle recurs here to a former assertion of his, that Jesus is higher than the angels, that he is none of those who can be called ordinary angels or messengers, but one of the most extraordinary kind, and the object of worship to all the angels of God. To worship any *creature* is idolatry, and God resents idolatry more than any other evil. Jesus Christ can be no creature, else the angels who worship him would be, must be guilty of idolatry, and God the author of that idolatry, who commanded those angels to worship Christ.

These words, "and let all the angels of God worship him, are taken from Psalm xcvii. 7, where they are translated by the Septuagint, worship him all ye angels. This Psalm the Apostle, therefore, understood of Christ, and in this the old Jewish interpreters agree with him; and though he is not mentioned in it by any of his usual Old Testament titles, except that of Jehovah, it clearly predicts the overthrow of idolatry by the introduction of the kingdom of this Jehovah. It follows, then, that, as idolatry was not overthrown by Judaism, but by the kingdom of Christ, it is Christ, as the head and author of this kingdom, of whom the Psalmist speaks, and whom he sees receiving the worship of the angels of God upon its introduction and establishment. This, also, agrees with the words by which the Apostle introduces the quotation. "And again, when he bringeth in the first-begotten into the *world*," the habitable world, which intimates that it was upon some solemn occasion, when engaged in some solemn act, that the angels were commanded to worship him, and this is represented in the xcvii. Psalm as the establishment of his kingdom.

The argument of the Apostle is thus made clear; he proves Christ superior to angels, and therefore Divine, because angels themselves are commanded "to *worship*

him." Nor is this the only prophetic psalm in which the religious worship of Messiah is predicted. The 72d Psalm, alone, is full of this doctrine. "They shall FEAR thee as long as the sun and moon endure." "All kings shall FALL DOWN (or, WORSHIP) before him; all nations shall SERVE him." "PRAYER shall be made ever for (or, to) him, and daily shall he be PRAISED."

Finally, as to the direct worship of Christ, the book of Revelation, in its scenec representations, exhibits him as, equally with the Father, the object of the worship of angels and of glorified saints; and, in chapter 5th, places every creature in the universe, the inhabitants of hell only excepted, in prostrate adoration at his footstool. "And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, AND UNTO THE LAMB for ever and ever."—*Watson.*

All parts of the creation, animate and inanimate, are represented here, by that figure of speech called *prosopopœia* or personification, as giving praise to the Lord Jesus, because by him all things were created. We find the whole creation gives precisely the same praise, and in the same terms, to Jesus Christ, who is undoubtedly meant here by the Lamb that was slain as they give to GOD who sits upon the throne. Now if Jesus Christ were not properly GOD, this would be idolatry, as it would be giving to the creature what belongs to the Creator.—*Clarke.*

To these instances are to be added all the doxologies to Christ, in common with the Father and the Holy Spirit, and all the benedictions made in his name in common with theirs; for all these are forms of worship. The first consist of ascriptions of equal and Divine honors, with grateful recognitions of the Being addressed, as the author of benefits received; the second are a solemn blessing of others in the name of God, and

were derived from the practice of the Jewish priests and the still older patriarchs, who blessed others in the name of Jehovah, as his representatives.

Of the first, the following may be given, as a few out of many instances. "The Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me to his heavenly kingdom: to whom be GLORY for ever and ever," 2 Tim. iv. 18. "But grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ: to him be GLORY both now and forever. Amen," 2 Pet. iii. 18. "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be GLORY and DOMINION for ever and ever. Amen," Rev. i. 5, 6. "When we consider the great difference between these doxologies and the commendations but sparingly given in the Scriptures to mere men, the serious and reverential manner in which they are introduced, and the superlative praise they convey, so far surpassing what humanity can deserve, we cannot but suppose that the being to whom they refer is really Divine. The ascription of eternal glory and everlasting dominion, if addressed to any creature, however exalted, would be idolatrous and profane." Of benedictions, the commencement and conclusion of several of the epistles furnish instances, so regular in their form, as to make it clearly appear that the Apostles and the priests of the New Testament constantly blessed the people ministerially in the name of Christ, as one of the blessed Trinity. This consideration alone shows that the benedictions are not, as Unitarians would take them, to be considered as cursory expressions of good will. "Grace to you, and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ." This, with little variation, is the common form of salutation; and the usual parting benediction is, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all." In answer to the Unitarian perversion, that these are

mere "wishes," it has been well and wisely observed, that "this objection overlooks, or notices very slightly, the point on which the whole question turns, the *nature* of the blessings sought, and the qualities which they imply in the Person as whose donation they are deliberately desired. These blessings are not of that kind which one creature is competent to bestow upon another. They refer to the judicial state of an accountable being before God, to the remission of moral offences, to the production and preservation of certain mental qualities which none can efficaciously and immediately give but he who holds the dominion of human minds and feeling, and to the enjoyments of supreme and endless felicity. They are *grace*, *mercy*, and *peace*. *Grace*, the free favor of the Eternal Majesty to those who have forfeited every claim to it, such favor as in its own nature and in the contemplation of the suplicant, is the sole and effective cause of deliverance from the greatest evils, and acquisition of the greatest good. *Mercy*, the compassion of infinite goodness, conferring its richest bestowments of holiness and happiness on the ruined, miserable, and helpless. *Peace*, the tranquil and delightful feeling which results from the rational hope of possessing these enjoyments. These are the highest blessings that Omnipotent Benevolence can give, or a dependent nature receive. To desire such blessings, either in the mode of direct address or in that of precatory wish, from any being who is not possessed of omnipotent goodness, would be, not 'innocent and proper,' but sinful and absurd in the highest degree. When, therefore, we find every Apostle whose epistles are extant, pouring out his 'expressions of desire,' with the utmost simplicity and energy, for these blessings, as proceeding from 'our Lord Jesus Christ,' equally with 'God our Father,' we cannot but regard it as the just and necessary conclusion that Christ and the Father are *one* in the perfection which originates the highest bless-

ings, and in the honor due for the gift of those blessings."

So clearly does the New Testament show that supreme worship was paid to Christ, as well as to the Father; and the practice obtained, as a matter of course, as a matter quite undisputed in the primitive Church, and has so continued, in all orthodox Churches to this day. Thus heathen writers represented the first Christians as worshippers of Christ; and, as for the practice of the primitive Church, it is not necessary to quote passages from the fathers, which are so well known, or so easily found in all books which treat on this subject. It is sufficient evidence of the practice, that when, in the fourth century, the Arians taught, that our Lord was a super-angelic *creature* only, they departed not, in the instance of worship, from the homage paid to him in the universal Church; but continued to adore Christ. On this ground the orthodox justly branded them with idolatry; and, in order to avoid the force of the charge, they invented these sophistical distinctions as to superior and inferior worship, which the Papists, in later times, introduced, in order to excuse the worship of saints and angels. *(Watson.)* And in this they have been followed by many modern Unitarians, especially by that class who call themselves Christians, as will appear from Mr. Millard's True Messiah, pp. 171, where he uses the following language: "That I worship the Son of God, is a fact; yet I do not worship him as the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."

But were this distinction founded in truth, it would be of but little service to the cause, in defence of which it is applied; because it has already been shown that Christ received supreme worship; and in addition to what has been said, we would also remark, that he who requires us to *think* of him as we do of the true God, would certainly have us worship him as such. But Christ would have us think of him as we do of the true God; for he attributes to himself the perfections of

God, and he claims an equality with him. Consequently, he would have us think of him, as we ought to do of God. He who speaks of himself, or directs others to speak of him as of the true God, would be acknowledged and worshipped as such. But Christ speaks, and would be spoken of by us as the true God. This appears from his taking the names, and ascribing to himself the works of God. If not, why does he assume such names, why does he declare that he performed such works as are proper to God, if he would not have us speak of him as God? What! shall *he* speak of himself as God—shall *he* assert that he created all things, and performed the works of God—and, after all, be unwilling that *we* should speak of him as God? Absurd to imagine, impossible to prove. He who requires we should do that for him which we cannot lawfully do for any but the true God, expects to be worshipped as such. But Christ requires us to do that for him, which we ought not to do for any but God. This appears from the fact that we are bound to love God above all things: consequently, an affection so ardent, and a duty so high, are due to none but God. We ought, however, to love Jesus above all things; to love him more than our lives, which, of all things in the world, are the dearest to us. He requires that we should suffer martyrdom for his sake; and by so doing, enjoins a duty which we do not, which we cannot owe to any but God. None of the Prophets, nor any of the Apostles ever said, "He that forsaketh not wife and children, and houses and lands, yea, and his own life, for my sake, is not worthy of me." Supreme worship was, therefore, paid to Christ.

This will also appear evident if we take into consideration the fact that there is nothing in the Sacred Scriptures to support the doctrine of superior and inferior worship. We often read of prayer, but there is not a syllable about absolute and relative, supreme and inferior prayer. We are commanded to pray fervently and

incessantly; but never sovereignly or absolutely. We have no rules left us about raising or lowering our intentions, in proportion to the dignity of the objects. Some instructions to this purpose might have been highly useful; and it is very strange, that, in a matter of so great importance, no directions should be given, either in Scripture, or, at least, in antiquity, how to regulate our intentions and meanings, with metaphysical exactness; so as to make our worship either high, higher, or highest of all, as occasion should require.

But a greater objection against this doctrine is, that the whole tenor of Scripture runs counter to it. This may be understood, in part, from what we have observed. To make it yet plainer, we will now take into consideration such acts and instances of worship as are laid down in Scripture, whether under the old or new dispensation.

Sacrifice was one instance of worship required under the law; and it is said, "He that sacrificeth unto any god, save unto the Lord only, he shall be utterly destroyed," Ex. xxii. 20. Now suppose any person, considering with himself that only absolute and sovereign sacrifice was appropriated to God, by this law, should have gone and sacrificed to other gods, and have been convicted of it before the judges:—the apology he must have made for it must have run thus: "Gentlemen, though I have sacrificed to other gods, yet, I hope you 'll observe that I did it not absolutely: I meant not any absolute or supreme sacrifice, (which is all that the law forbids,) but relative and inferior only. I regulated my intentions with all imaginable care, and my esteem with the most critical exactness: I considered the other gods whom I sacrificed to as inferior only, and infinitely so, reserving all sovereign sacrifice to the supreme God of Israel." This, or the like apology, must have brought off the criminal, with some applause for his acuteness, if the doctrine of superior and inferior worship be true. Unitarians must either admit this, or be

content to say that not only absolute supreme sacrifice, but *all* sacrifice was, by law, appropriated to God only.

Another instance of worship is, making of vows, religious vows. We find as little appearance of the above distinction here as in the former case. We read nothing of sovereign and inferior, absolute and relative vows; that we should imagine supreme vows to be appropriate to God, inferior permitted to angels or idols, or to any creature.

Swearing is another instance much of the same kind with the foregoing. Swearing by God's name is a plain thing, and well understood, but if Unitarians tell us of sovereign and inferior swearing, according to the inward respect or intention they have, in proportion to the dignity of the person by whose name they swear, it must sound perfectly new to us. All swearing which comes short in its respect, or falls below sovereign, will, we are afraid, be little better than profaneness.

Such being the case in respect to the acts of religious worship already mentioned, I now ask, what is there so peculiar in the case of prayer and adoration, that they should not be thought of the same kind with the other? Why should not absolute and relative prayer and prostration appear as absurd as absolute and relative sacrifice, vows, oaths, or the like? They are acts and instances of religious worship like the other; appropriated to God in the same manner, and by the same laws, and upon the same grounds and reasons. Unitarians imagine that acts of religious worship are to derive their signification and quality from the intention and meaning of the worshippers, whereas, the very reverse of it is the truth. Their meaning and signification is fixed and determined by God himself; and, therefore, we are never to use them with any other meaning, under peril of profaneness or idolatry. God has not left us at liberty to fix what sense we please upon religious worship, to render it high or low, absolute or relative, at discretion, supreme when offered to

God, and if to others, inferior: as when to angels, or saints, or images, in suitable proportion. No, religion was not made for metaphysical heads only, such as might nicely distinguish the several degrees and elevations of respect and honor among many objects. The short and plain way, which (in pity to human infirmity, and to prevent confusion) it has pleased God to take with us, is to make all religious worship his own; and so it is sovereign of course. This I take to be the Scriptural as well as only reasonable account of the object of worship. We need not concern ourselves (it is but vain to pretend to it) about determining the sense and meaning of religious worship. God himself has taken care of it; and it is already determined to our hands. It means, whether we will or no, it means, by Divine institution and appointment, the Divinity, the supremacy, the sovereignty of its object. To misapply those marks of dignity, those appropriate ensigns of Divine majesty; to compliment any creature with them, and thereby to make common what God has made proper, is to deify the works of God's hands, and to serve the creature instead of the Creator, God blessed for ever.—*Waterland.*

Let us now consider the religious principles which were held by the Apostles and followers of our Saviour, in order to determine whether they could have worshipped him with any thing less than supreme worship. "They were Jews; and Jews of an age in which their nation had long shaken off its idolatrous propensities, and which was distinguished by its zeal against all worship, or expressions of religious trust and hope being directed, not only to false gods, (to idols,) but to creatures. The great principle of the law was, 'Thou shalt have no other gods before (or, besides) me.' It was, therefore, commanded by Moses, 'Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and him shalt thou serve;' which words are quoted by our Lord in his temptation, when solicited to worship Satan, so as to prove that to *fear*

God and to *serve* him are expressions which signify *worship*, and that all other beings but God are excluded from it. 'Thou shalt WORSHIP the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.' The argument, too, in the quotation, is not that Satan had no right to receive worship because he was an evil spirit; but that, whatever he might be, or whoever should make that claim, God only is to be worshipped. By this, also, we see that Christianity made no alteration in Judaism, as to the article of doctrine, for our Lord himself here adopts it as his own principle; he quotes it from the writings of Moses, and so transmitted it, on his own authority, to his followers. Accordingly, we find the Apostles teaching and practising this as a first principle of their religion. St. Paul (Rom. i. 21—25) charges the heathen with not *glorifying* God when they *knew* him, and worshipping and serving 'the *creature* more than (or, besides) the Creator, who is blessed for ever.' 'Wherein the Apostle,' says Waterland, 'plainly intimates, that the Creator only is to be served, and that the idolatry of the Heathens lay in their worshipping of the *creature*. He does not blame them for giving *sovereign* or *absolute* worship to creatures, they could scarcely be so silly as to imagine there could be more than one supreme God; but for giving any worship to them at all, sovereign or inferior.' Again: when he mentions it as one of the crimes of the Galatians, previous to their conversion to Christianity, that they 'did SERVICE unto them which by *nature* were no gods,' he plainly intimates, that no one has a title to religious *service* but he who is by *nature* God; and, if so, he himself could not worship or do service to Christ, unless he believed him to possess a *natural* and *essential* divinity.

"The practice of the Apostles, too, was in strict accordance with this principle. Thus, when worship was offered to St. Peter, by Cornelius, who certainly did not take him to be God, he forbade it: so also Paul and Barnabas forbade it at Lystra, with expressions of hor-

ror, when offered to them. An eminent instance is recorded, also, of the exclusion of all creatures, however exalted, from this honor, in Rev. xix. 10, where the angel refuses to receive so much as the outward act of adoration, giving this rule and maxim upon it, '*Worship* GOD;' intimating thereby, that God only is to be worshipped; that all acts of religious worship are appropriated to God alone. He does not say, 'Worship God, and whom God shall appoint to be worshipped,' as if he had appointed any besides God; nor 'Worship God with sovereign worship,' as if any inferior sort of worship was permitted to be paid to creatures; but simply, plainly, and briefly, '*Worship* GOD.'

"From the known and avowed religious sentiments, then, of the Apostles, both as Jews and as Christians, as well as from their practice, it follows, that they could not pay religious worship to Christ, a fact which has already been established, except they had considered him as a Divine Person, and themselves as bound, on that account, according to his own words, to *honor the Son, even as they honored the Father.*"—*Watson.*

Efforts have also been made to reduce the worship paid to our Saviour into nothing more than expressions of respect which was paid to Eastern rulers. But our Lord was worshipped during his incarnation, while he cautiously avoided giving the least sanction to the notion that he had any civil pretensions, and that his object was to make himself king. It would, therefore, have been a marked inconsistency to suffer himself to be saluted with the homage of prostration proper to civil governors, and which, indeed, was not always in Judea, rendered to them. He did not receive this homage, then, under the character of a civil ruler or sovereign; and under what character could he receive it? Not in compliance with the haughty custom of the Jewish Rabbis, who exacted great external reverence from their disciples, for he sharply reproved their haughtiness and love of adulation and honor: not as a simple teacher of

religion, for his Apostles might then have imitated his example, since, upon the Unitarian hypothesis, they, when they had collected disciples and founded churches, had as clear a right to this distinction as he himself, had it only been one of appropriate and common courtesy sanctioned by their master. But when do we read of their receiving worship without spurning it on the very ground that "they were MEN of like passions" with others? How, then, is it to be accounted for, that our Lord never forbade or discouraged this practice as to himself, or even shunned it? In no other way, than that he was conscious of his natural right to the homage thus paid; and that he accepted it as the expression of a *faith* which, though sometimes wavering, because of the obscurity which darkened the minds of his followers, and which even his own conduct, mysterious as it necessarily was, till "he openly showed himself" after his passion, tended to produce, yet sometimes pierced through the cloud, and saw and acknowledged, in the Word made flesh, "the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth."

But if Jesus Christ is God, our opponents inquire with much triumph, how he could be born and die? how he could grow in wisdom and stature? how he could be subject to law? be tempted? stand in need of prayer? how his soul could be "exceeding sorrowful even unto death?" be "forsaken of his Father?" purchase the church with "his own blood?" have "a joy set before him?" be a mediator between God and man? be exalted? have "all power in heaven and earth" *given* to him? &c. It should, however, be remembered that he was also man, that "in him were united two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and manhood." This being the fact with regard to our Saviour, the above objections lose all their force: for, as man, he could pass through all these changes, while in his Divine nature he remains the same, the unchangeable God; and that this doctrine of two natures, in the person of

Christ, is correct, will appear evident from the fact that the Scriptures speak of him as "the Prince of life," who was "killed," Acts iii. 15; "the Lord of glory," who was infamously "crucified," 1 Cor. ii. 8; "the root of Jesse," "and a rod out of the stem of Jesse," Isa. xi. 1, 10; "the Lord," and the "Son," the "root and the offspring of David," Matt. xxii. 45; Rev. xxii. 16; the "Lord of all," and the servant of men, Acts x. 36; Matt. xx. 28; "the Word, which was God, and was made flesh," John i. 1, 14; "who was in the form of God, and was made in the likeness of men," Phil. ii. 6, 7; the Son of God, and the Son of man; the fellow of Jehovah and of men, Zech. xiii. 7; Heb. ii. 9; eternal, and yet beginning, Mic. v. 2; "having life in himself," John i. 4, and yet being dependent; "filling all in all," and lying in a manger, Eph. i. 23; "knowing all things," and yet ignorant of some, John xxi. 17; "almighty," and yet "crucified through weakness," Rev. i. 8; 2 Cor. xiii. 4; always "the same," and yet undergoing many changes, Heb. i. 12; "reigning for ever," and yet resigning the kingdom, Isa. ix. 7; 1 Cor. xv. 24; "equal with God," and yet subordinate, Phil. ii. 6, &c.; "one" with God, and yet a Mediator between God and men, John x. 30; 1 Tim. ii. 5. These passages clearly prove both the Divinity and humanity of our Saviour, and are perfectly irreconcilable on any other hypothesis. Unitarians are therefore under the necessity of admitting the correctness of this theory, or of saying, as some of them have done, that the Scriptures are contradictory, and therefore not Divinely inspired.* They may take either horn of this dilemma. If they yield the point that Christ was both God and man, they, as above remarked, give up the whole force of their objection. If they say that the Bible contradicts itself, we shall then be prepared to meet them, not as disguised, but as open and avowed infidels.

* See the extracts from Mr. Parker and Dr. Priestley, on page 6.

Unitarians have also attempted to confound the terms Person and Essence, and thereby have endeavored to make Trinitarians assert, that there are three essences, and consequently three Gods; but that one being should necessarily include one person *only*, is what none can prove from the nature of things; and all that can be affirmed on the subject is, that it is so in fact among all intelligent creatures with which we are acquainted. Among them, distinct persons are only seen in *separate beings*, but this separation of being is clearly an *accident* of personality, for the circumstance of separation forms no part of the idea of personality itself, which is confined to a capability of performing personal acts. In God, the distinct persons are represented as having a common foundation in *one being:* but this union also forms no part of the idea of personality, nor can be proved inconsistent with it. The manner of the union, it is granted, is incomprehensible, and so is Deity himself, and every essential attribute with which his nature is invested. The objection, therefore, founded upon the terms person and essence will have no force until Unitarians prove that these terms are synonimous, or that God cannot exist in three persons; which they cannot do. For though each person be *of* the essence, yet the three persons together do constitute *the* essence: And though the whole essence is inseparably connected with each of the persons, both in willing and working, yet it cannot be said with any propriety, that the Father is the whole Essence of the Son, or the Holy Ghost, notwithstanding they are distinctly and by themselves essentially divine. Thus, it will appear, that though *Essence* and *Person* differ as to the full extent of the terms, yet they perfectly agree when they apply to the reality of the Deity. Each person by himself is God, but not the Godhead; and the Godhead is in each person, but is not each person. From this relative distinction, it follows, that the Son and Spirit, being persons in Jehovah and inseparable from the essence, are

both personally and essentially Jehovah, and consequently, either in union or distinction, are the object of worship. In fact, as true believers, we do not and cannot worship any one of the Divine Persons separate or alone, however we may mention each by themselves; for if we invocate the *Son*, we invocate the *Divine Essence*, which is inseparable from the Son, and consequently invocate the Father and the Holy Ghost. The same may be observed, if we address the other persons. By this, we may understand what our Lord implies, when he says, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father: I and my Father are one," &c. so the apostle, "He that hath the Son, hath the Father also." If this doctrine of three persons in one essence, or of the one essence existing, indivisibly though distinctly, in the three persons, were rightly stated, there would seem but little room for the disputes respecting the proper object of worship and the inferiority or subordination of the Divine persons.

To attempt, therefore, a refutation of the Divinity of Christ, by saying, "There are two very and eternal Gods," which is the course pursued by many Unitarians, is mere folly. It has no force only on the supposition that the doctrine of the Trinity is not true; and of course does not affect us. The point at issue lies between our opposers and the Bible! It says Christ is God. *They* say he is not, or there are two Gods. Whatever weight they put upon this objection, I am satisfied of its fallacy, because it is placed against the Scriptures. And while they prefer it, however plausible it may appear, they give sufficient evidence that they prefer the wisdom of the world to that which cometh from above.

CHAPTER V.

DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

Having, in the two preceding chapters, established the proper personality and Divinity of the Holy Spirit, as well as the Supreme Deity of Jesus Christ, from which it necessarily follows that the doctrine of the Trinity is true, we now approach, in a more direct manner, this great mystery of our faith, for the declaration of which we are so exclusively indebted to the Scriptures, that not only is it incapable of proof *a priori*, but it derives no direct confirmatory evidence from the existence and wise and orderly arrangements of the works of God. It stands, however, on the unshaken foundation of his own word; that testimony which he has given of himself in both Testaments, and if we see no traces of it, as of his simple being and operative perfections, in the works of his creative power and wisdom, the reason is that creation, in itself, could not be the medium of manifesting, or of illustrating it. Some, it is true, have thought the *Trinity of Divine persons in the Unity of the Godhead* demonstrable by natural reason. Poiret and others, formerly, and Professor Kidd, recently, have all attempted to prove, not that this doctrine implies a contradiction, but that it cannot be denied without a contradiction; and that it is impossible but that the Divine Nature should so exist. The former endeavors to prove that neither creation, nor indeed any action in the Deity was possible, but from this tri-unity. But his arguments, were they adduced, would scarcely be considered satisfactory, even by those whose belief in this doctrine is most settled. The latter argues from notions of duration and space, which themselves have not hitherto been satisfactorily

established, and if they had, would yield but slight assistance in such an investigation. This, however, may be said respecting such attempts, that they at least show that men quite as eminent for strength of understanding and logical acuteness as any who have decried the doctrine of the Trinity as irrational and contradictory, find no such opposition in it to the reason or to the nature of things, as the latter pretend to be almost self-evident. The very opposite conclusions reached by the parties, when they reason the matter by the light of their own intellect only, is a circumstance, it is true, which lessens our confidence in pretended rational demonstrations; but it gives neither party a right to assume any thing at the expense of the other. Such failures ought, indeed, to produce in us a proper sense of the inadequacy of human powers to search the deep things of God, and they forcibly exhibit the necessity of Divine teaching in every thing which relates to such subjects, and demand from us an entire docility of mind, where God himself has condescended to become our instructor.

But as Unitarians are very clamorous in their appeals to the early fathers, we shall, before we proceed to examine the testimony of Scripture, endeavor to prove, from the testimony of "the fathers of the first three centuries, that the Divinity of the Son and of the Holy Ghost was, from the days of the Apostles, acknowledged by the Catholic Church, and that those who maintained a contrary opinion were considered as heretics; and as every one knows that neither the Divinity of the Father, nor the unity of the Godhead was ever called in question at any period, it follows that the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity has been in substance, in all its constituent parts, always known among Christians. In the fourth century it became the subject of eager and general controversy; and it was not till then that this doctrine was particularly discussed. While there was no denial or dispute, proof and defence were unnecessary.

But this doctrine is positively mentioned as being admitted among Catholic Christians, by writers who lived long before that age of controversy. Justin Martyr, in refuting the charge of atheism against Christians, because they did not believe in the gods of the Heathen, expressly says, 'We worship and adore the Father and the Son who came from him and taught us these things, and the prophetic Spirit;' and soon after, in the same apology, he undertakes to show the reasonableness of the honor paid by Christians to the Father in the first place, to the Son in the second, and to the Holy Ghost in the third; and says, that their assigning the second place to a crucified man was, by unbelievers, denominated madness, because they were ignorant of the mystery, which he then proceeds to explain. Athenagoras, in replying to the same charge of atheism urged against Christians, because they refused to worship the false gods of the Heathen, says, 'Who would not wonder, when he knows that we, who call upon God the Father, and God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit, showing their power in the Unity, and their distinction in order, should be called atheists?' Clement of Alexandria not only mentions three Divine persons, but invokes them as the one only God. Praxeas, Sabellius, and other Unitarians, accused the orthodox Churches of tritheism, which is of itself a clear proof that the orthodox worshipped the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Tertullian, in writing against Praxeas, maintains, that a Trinity, rationally conceived, is consistent with truth; and that unity irrationally conceived forms heresy. He had before said, in speaking of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, that 'there are three of one substance, and of one condition, and of one power, because there is one God;' and he afterwards adds, 'The connection of the Father in the Son, and of the Son in the Comforter, makes three united together, the one with the other; which three are one thing, not one person; as it is said, I and the Father are one thing,

with regard to the unity of substance, not to the singularity of number;' and he also expressly says, 'The Father is God, and the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God;' and again, 'The Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, believed to be three, constitute one God.' And in another part of his works he says, 'There is a Trinity of one Divinity, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost.' And Tertullian not only maintains these doctrines, but asserts that they were prior to any heresy, and had, indeed, been the faith of Christians from the first promulgation of the gospel. To these writers of the second century, we may add Origen and Cyprian in the third; the former of whom mentions baptism (alluding to its appointed form) as 'the source and fountain of graces to him who dedicates himself to the Divinity of the adorable Trinity.' And the latter, after reciting the same form of baptism, says that 'by it Christ delivered the doctrine of the Trinity, unto which mystery or sacrament the nations were to be baptized.' It would be easy to multiply quotations upon this subject; but these are amply sufficient to show the opinions of the early fathers, and to refute the assertion that the doctrine of the Trinity was an invention of the fourth century."—*Watson.*

The decision of the council of Nice may also be considered as establishing the position that the doctrine of the Trinity was held by the first Christian churches, and therefore by the Apostles. This council met in the year 325, and is thus spoken of by Eusebius Pamphilus, who was one of its members:

"The most distinguished ministers of God met together from every part of Europe, Asia, and Africa. The sacred edifice, as if enlarged by the pleasure of God, inclosed at the same time within its walls, both Syrians and Cilicians, Phenicians, Arabians, and inhabitants of Palestine; Egyptians, Thebeans, and Lybians, with others arriving from Mesopotamia. A bishop from Persia was also present. Nor was the

Scythian absent from this assembly. Pontus, also, and Gallatia, Pamphylia and Cappadocia, Asia and Phrygia furnished representatives from their most able divines. Thracians, too, Macedonians, Achaians and Epirotes, and those who resided at a vast distance beyond them, were convened. That illustrious Spaniard, who is so highly spoken of, took his seat with the others. The prelate of the imperial city, indeed, was absent on account of his advanced years, but his place was supplied by presbyters. Constantine, alone, of all the princes who ever lived, wove so brilliant a crown as this, joined together by the bond of peace, as a suitable acknowledgment of gratitude to heaven for the victories vouchsafed him over his enemies, and dedicated it to God his Saviour, in bringing together so great a convention; an image, as it were, of the Apostolic assembly. For it is related that in the times of the Apostles religious men were gathered together from every nation under heaven. Among them were Parthians, Medes, Elamites, and inhabitants of Mesopotamia, Judea and Cappadocia, Pontus, Asia, and Pamphylia, Egypt, and the parts of Lybia, which is near Cyrene; strangers, also, of Rome, Jews and proselytes, Cretes and Arabians. In that congregation, however, there was this circumstance of inferiority, that all who were collected together were not ministers of God, while the present assembly included more than two hundred and fifty bishops; but such a multitude of presbyters, deacons and acolothists accompanied them, that it was difficult to determine their number. Among these holy ministers, some excelled by the wisdom and eloquence of their discourse, others by the gravity of their deportment and patience of labor; [and others, again, by their humility, and the gentleness of their manners. Some of them were honored on account of their gray hairs, while others were recommended by their youthful vigor and activity both of body and mind." Yet, notwithstanding the number, the piety, and tal-

ents of the men who composed this Council, they unanimously, with the exception of five, signed the following creed, so much despised by Unitarians, because it contains the doctrine of the Trinity:

"We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things, visible, and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the only begotten of the Father, that is, of the substance of the Father; God of God, light of light, true God of true God; begotten, not made, consubstantial with the Father, by whom all things were made, both in heaven and in earth; who for us men, and for our salvation, descended, was incarnate, and was made man, and suffered, and rose again the third day; he ascended into heaven, and shall come to judge the living and the dead: And in the Holy Spirit. But the holy catholic and apostolic Church of God anathematizes those who affirm that there was a time when the Son was not, or that he was not before he was begotten, or that he was made of things not existing; or who say, that the Son of God was of any other substance or essence, or created, or liable to change or conversion."

"The remarkable unanimity of the synod on this subject, which is the only one examined by that convention, which excites much interest at the present day, may be considered, under the peculiar circumstances of the case, as affording a powerful confirmation of the truth of this important doctrine. Every part of the Christian world was virtually represented by men, who, for their commanding station and favorable opportunities, must be supposed to have been well acquainted with what was understood to have been the doctrine of the Apostles on this important article of our faith. Most of them, probably, lived within two centuries of the death of St. John. Could the original doctrine have been lost in a period so comparatively short? Could it have been corrupted? Could it have been generally corrupted throughout the Church? If not, the fathers

of Nice must have held, in this respect, the faith delivered by the first preachers of Christianity, and consequently the true one. They could not have been ignorant of what was and had been believed in their respective countries. The agreement, therefore, on this point, of so many different nations, as expressed by their representatives, nations of such various characters, pursuits, manners, customs and prejudices, can be satisfactorily accounted for only on the supposition that they had received their belief from a common source, and preserved it pure by tradition, during the few generations which had elapsed from the time when they first received the gospel from the Apostles themselves, or from those who lived not long after the apostolic age. It may be said, that many of the members of the council might have been deterred from expressing their real belief, as some few of them undoubtedly were, from the fear of exile or deposition. But they appear to have been almost unanimous on this subject before any threats of that kind were held out, and therefore such an apprehension could have operated on a very small number only; and if even a mere majority had been Arians, the danger would obviously have been on the other side. St. Chrysostom remarks, that it would be absurd to charge the council, composed as it was, in a great measure, of saints and confessors, either with ignorance or fear. Nor does this reflection seem to be unfounded. For, how can it be reasonably supposed, that in the situation in which they were placed, and which has already been adverted to, they could be in any doubt whether our Lord was Divine in the strict sense of the term, or a creature only, however exalted in rank and dignity; or that such men would have disguised their genuine persuasion from a fear of losing their sacerdotal honors, or of missing those temporal advantages and emoluments which they might naturally have expected to enjoy under the dominion of a Christian prince? Was it for them, men of unblemished integrity and vir-

tue, basely to violate their consciences for "a piece of bread?" or descend, for the sake of office, from their elevated position, as "good soldiers of Jesus Christ," to the meanness of subterfuge and dissimulation? Was it for men who were born and grew up amidst scenes of pagan insult, cruelty and oppression, and many of whom, for their courageous defence of the truth, had been deprived of their substance, or loaded with chains, or confined in a dungeon, or maimed and disfigured in their persons; and who would doubtless have accompanied their heroic brethren in the faith, 'counting not their lives dear unto them,' to the scaffold or the stake; or would have expired in torments on the rack, or been nailed to the cross, or become food for lions, rather than blaspheme that worthy name whereby they were called;"—was it for *them* to stoop to such moral degradation? men, too, some of whom had been distinguished by the episcopal mitre at a period when it was so far from advancing their worldly interest, that it only exposed them more surely to the 'loss of all things,' added to their toils, their trials, and their sufferings, and served but to render them a more conspicuous mark for heathen persecution?" *(Boyle.)* Fear, then, could have had no influence over these men when they signed the above creed, which so clearly embraces the doctrine of the Trinity. They therefore signed it deliberately and from *choice*, as expressing their religious sentiments on this important subject. We must, therefore, admit that the Nicene fathers were Trinitarians; and if so, this must have been the faith of the Apostles, unless we suppose that the Church, during this short period from the Apostles, (325 years,) had become *universally* corrupt, which is far from the truth; for, although some had departed from the faith and denied the Lord that bought them, yet the followers of Christ, in *general*, down to this period, adhered to the doctrines of the Saviour and his Apostles.

Dr. Mosheim, who is often appealed to by our oppo-

nents, in his Ecclesiastical History, gives decided testimony to the fact that this doctrine of the Trinity was the doctrine of the Church during the three first centuries, for he expressly says, that "the Church, indeed, had frequently decided *against* the Sabellians and others, that there was a *real difference* between the Father and Son, and that the Holy Ghost was distinct from them both; or as we commonly speak, that three distinct persons exist in the Deity; but the mutual relation of these persons to each other, and the nature of that distinction that subsists between them, are matters that hitherto were neither disputed nor explained." Let it be remarked that the Dr. is here speaking of the Church previous to the council of Nice, and that the Sabellians were Unitarians, who contended that there was but one person in the Godhead; but during the three first centuries the church had frequently decided against this, and consequently in favor of the Trinity, or that there was, as Dr. Mosheim expresses it, "three distinct persons in the Deity." This doctrine was, therefore, the doctrine of the Church of Christ during the days of the Apostles, Martyrs and primitive Christians.

This position is also established by the history of the controversy itself which proves that the doctrine of the Trinity "was held as an article of faith in the church anterior to the Nicene convention; if not, about what did Arius find fault? And why did he remonstrate against the doctrine of the Church, without alledging that it was not till then corrupt? And also from the fact that when Trypho, the Jew, and Apulius, the skeptic, set up their opposition against the Christian religion on account of the folly that they conceived there was in subscribing to so paradoxical an article as they represented that of the Trinity to be, and that their able antagonists, Justin Martyr and Origen, did not deny the fact, there can remain no doubt that they did hold it as a fundamental article of their faith.

As this controversy has not been much agitated of

late years as far in the country as where that class of Unitarians who claim to be called Christians mostly prevail, they amuse the people with an idea that the priests of the several denominations who believe in the doctrine of the Trinity have purposely kept them in ignorance on this subject; intimating that their silence, which necessity has not disturbed on account of the victory this truth has so long since obtained over the error that is opposed to it, is the studied effect of a fear to have it investigated; and that they have come to tear away the veil and expose the secret. This impression being carried to the minds of the people by the cautious method of these teachers in communicating it, naturally associates with it an idea that the world has always been thus imposed on, and they of course think more favorably of the cause which is thus shrewdly represented as being oppressed by the art of designing men, than they would if they knew that it had frequently been tested, and always failed under the most favorable circumstances to succeed.

To expose this deception, the above remarks have been offered, and we think they are sufficient to show the candid reader that so far is the doctrine of the Trinity from having its origin in the dark ages of the Church, that it has been handed down to us from the Saviour and his Apostles.

2. The antiquity and universal spread of this doctrine may be argued in favor of its truth. "That nearly all the Pagan nations of antiquity, says Bishop Tomline, in their various theological systems, acknowledged a kind of Trinity, has been fully evinced by those learned men who have made the Heathen mythology the subject of their elaborate inquiries. The almost universal prevalence of this doctrine in the Gentile kingdoms must be considered as a strong argument in favor of its truth. The doctrine itself bears such striking internal marks of a divine original, and is so very unlikely to have been the invention of mere human reason, that

there is no way of accounting for the general adoption of so singular a belief, but by supposing that it was revealed by God to the early patriarchs, and that it was transmitted by them to their posterity. In its progress, indeed, to remote countries, and to distant generations, this belief became depraved and corrupted in the highest degree; and he alone who brought 'life and immortality to light,' could restore it to its original simplicity and purity. The discovery of the existence of this doctrine in the early ages, among the nations whose records have been the best preserved, has been of great service to the cause of Christianity, and completely refutes the assertion of infidels and skeptics, that the sublime and mysterious doctrine of the Trinity owes its origin to the philosophers of Greece. 'If we extend,' says Mr. Maurice, 'our eye through the remote region of antiquity, we shall find this very doctrine, which the primitive Christians are said to have borrowed from the Platonic school, universally and immemorially flourishing in all those countries where history and tradition have united to fix those virtuous ancestors of the human race, who, for their distinguished attainments in piety, were admitted to a familiar intercourse with Jehovah and the angels, the divine heralds of his commands.'"

3. We will now appeal to the testimony of Scripture. The first argument drawn from this source will be founded on the word Elohim, a noun "of the plural number, by which the Creator is expressed. This appears as evidently to point toward a plurality of persons in the divine nature, as the verb in the singular, with which it is joined, does to the unity of that nature: 'In the beginning God created;' with strict attention to grammatical propriety, the passage should be rendered, 'In the beginning Gods created,' but our belief in the unity of God forbids us thus to translate the word Elohim. Since, therefore, Elohim is plural, and no plural can consist of less than two in number, and since creation can alone be the work of Deity, we are to un-

derstand by this term so particularly used in this place, God the Father, and the eternal Logos, or Word of God; that Logos whom St. John, supplying us with an excellent comment upon this passage, says, was in the beginning with God, and who also was God. As the Father and the Son are expressly pointed out in the first verse of this chapter, so is the Third Person in the blessed Trinity not less decisively revealed to us in Gen. i. 2: 'And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters:' 'brooded upon' the water, *incubavit*, as a hen broods over her eggs. Thus we see the Spirit exerted upon this occasion an active effectual energy; by that energy agitating the vast abyss, and infusing into it a powerful vital principle.

"Elohim seems to be the general appellation by which the Triune Godhead is collectively distinguished in Scripture; and in the concise history of the creation only, the expression, *bara Elohim*, 'the Gods created,' is used above thirty times. The combining this plural noun with a verb in the singular would not appear so remarkable, if Moses had uniformly adhered to that mode of expression; for then it would be evident that he adopted the mode used by the Gentiles in speaking of their false gods in the plural number, but by joining with it a singular verb or adjective, rectified a phrase that might appear to give a direct sanction to the error of polytheism. But, in reality, the reverse is the fact; for, in Deut. xxxii. 15, 17, and other places, he uses the singular number of this very noun to express the Deity, though not employed in the august work of creation: 'He forsook God,' *Eloah;* 'they sacrificed to devils not to God,' *Eloah.* But farther, Moses himself uses this very word Elohim with verbs and adjectives in the plural. Of this usage Dr. Allix enumerates many other striking instances that might be brought from the Pentateuch; and other inspired writers use it in the same manner in various parts of the Old Testament, Job xxxv. 10; Joshua xxiv. 19; Psalm cix. 1; Eccle-

siastes xii. 3; 2 Samuel vii. 23. It must appear, therefore, to every reader of reflection, exceedingly singular, that when Moses was endeavoring to establish a theological system, of which the unity of the Godhead was the leading principle, and in which it differed from all other systems, he should make use of terms directly implicative of a plurality in it; yet so deeply was the awful truth under consideration impressed upon the mind of the Hebrew legislator, that this is constantly done by him; and, indeed, as Allix has observed, there is scarcely any method of speaking from which a plurality in Deity may be inferred, that is not used either by himself in the Pentateuch, or by the other inspired writers in various parts of the Old Testament."

Unitarians have attempted to evade the force of the argument drawn from the word Elohim, by saying that this is given to Moses, Abraham, and several other celebrated characters among the Jews. This, however, is a mistake; Dr. Adam Clark, who was certainly both a competent and honest Hebrew critic, expressly says, that the word Elohim is never a human appellation in any instance except one, and that is in these words of the Saviour, "I said ye are Gods," (Elohim) but in this case it is certainly plural, as well as in all others; and, therefore, when applied to God, it must express a plurality of persons in the Divine essence.

4. "If the argument above offered should still appear inconclusive, the twenty-sixth verse of the first chapter of Genesis contains so pointed an attestation to the truth of it, that, when duly considered, it must stagger the most hardened skeptic; for in that text not only the plurality is unequivocally expressed, but the act which is the peculiar prerogative of Deity is mentioned together with that plurality, the one circumstance illustrating the other, and both being highly elucidatory of this doctrine: 'And God (Elohim) said, Let *us* make man in our image, after our likeness.' Why the Deity should speak of himself in the plural number, unless that Deity

consisted of more than one person, it is difficult to conceive; for the answer given by modern" Unitarians, "that this is only a figurative mode of expression, implying the high dignity of the speaker, and that it is usual for earthly sovereigns to use this language by way of distinction, is futile, for two reasons. In the first place, it is highly degrading to the Supreme Majesty to suppose he would take his model of speaking and thinking from man, though it is highly consistent with the vanity of man to arrogate to himself, as doubtless was the case in the licentiousness of succeeding ages, the style and imagined conceptions of Deity; and it will be remembered, that these solemn words were spoken before the creation of any of those mortals, whose false notions of greatness and sublimity the Almighty is thus impiously supposed to adopt. In truth, there does not seem to be any real dignity in an expression, which, when used by a human sovereign in relation to himself, approaches very near to absurdity. The genuine fact, however, appears to be this. When the tyrants of the east first began to assume divine honors, they assumed likewise the majestic language appropriated to, and highly becoming, the Deity, but totally inapplicable to man. The error was propagated from age to age through a long succession of despots, and at length Judaic apostacy arrived at such a pitch of profane absurdity, as to affirm that very phraseology to be borrowed from man which was the original and peculiar language of the Divinity. It was, indeed, remarkably pertinent when applied to Deity; for, in a succeeding chapter, we have more decisive authority for what is thus asserted, where the Lord God himself says, 'Behold, the man is become as one of us;' a very singular expression, which some Jewish commentators, with equal effrontery, contend was spoken by the Deity to the council of angels, that, according to their assertions, attended him at the creation. From the name of the Lord God being used in so emphatical a manner, it evidently appears to be ad-

dressed to those sacred persons to whom it was before said, 'Let us make man;' for would indeed the omnipotent Jehovah, presiding in a less dignified council, use words that have such an evident tendency to place the Deity on a level with created beings?"

5. "The solemn form of bendiction, in which the Jewish High Priests were commanded to bless the children of Israel," may be considered as a strong argument in favor of the Trinity, "and singularly answers to the form of benediction so general in the close of the Apostolic Epistles, and which so appropriately closes the solemn services of Christian worship. It is given in Numbers vi. 24—27.

> Jehovah bless thee and keep thee:
> Jehovah make his face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee:
> Jehovah lift his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace.

"If the three members of this form of benediction be attentively considered, they will be found to agree respectively to the three persons taken in the usual order of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The Father is the author of *blessing* and *preservation*, *illumination* and *grace* are from the Son, *illumination* and *peace* from the Spirit, the teacher of truth and the Comforter."—*Watson.*

"The first member of the formula expresses the benevolent 'love of God,' the father of Mercies, and fountain of all good; the second well comports with the redeeming and reconciling 'grace of our Lord Jesus Christ;' and the last is appropriate to the purity, consolation and joy, which are received from the 'communion of the Holy Spirit."—*Smith.*

"The connection of certain specific blessings in this form of benediction with the Jehovah mentioned three times distinctly, and those which are represented as flowing from the Father, Son, and Spirit in the apostolic form, would be a singular coincidence, if it even stood alone; but the light of the same eminent truth breaks

forth from other partings of the clouds of the early morning of revelation.

"The inner part of the Jewish Sanctuary was called the Holy of Holies, that is the holy place of the Holy ones; and the number of these is indicated and limited to three in the celebrated vision of Isaiah, and that with great explicitness. The scene of that vision is the holy place of the Temple, and lies, therefore, in the very abode and residence of the Holy ones, here celebrated by the seraphs, who veiled their faces before them. And one cried unto another, and said, '*Holy, Holy, Holy* is the Lord of Hosts.' This passage, if it stood alone, might be eluded by saying that this act of Divine adoration, here mentioned, is merely emphatic, or in the Hebrew mode of expressing a *superlative*, though that is assumed and by no means proved. It is, however, worthy of serious notice, that this distinct *trine* act of adoration, which has been so often supposed to mark a plurality of persons as the objects of it, is answered by a voice from that excellent glory which overwhelmed the mind of the Prophet when he was favored with the vision, responding in the same language of plurality in which the doxology of the seraphs is expressed. 'Also I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?' But this is not the only evidence that in this passage the Holy ones who were addressed each by his appropriate and equal distinction of *holy*, were the *three* Divine subsistencies in the Godhead. The being addressed is the 'Lord of Hosts.' This all acknowledge to include the Father; but the Evangelist John, xii. 41, in manifest reference to this transaction, observes, 'These things said Esaias, when he saw his (Christ's) glory, and spake of him.' In this vision, therefore, we have the Son also, whose glory on this occasion the Prophet is said to have beheld. Acts xxviii. 25, determines that there was also the presence of the Holy Ghost. 'Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the Prophet unto our fathers, saying,

Go unto this people and say, Hearing ye shall hear and not understand, and seeing ye shall see and not perceive,' &c. These words, quoted from Isaiah, the Apostle Paul declares to have been spoken by the Holy Ghost, and Isaiah declares them to have been spoken on this very occasion by the 'Lord of Hosts.' 'And he said, Go and tell this people, Hear ye indeed and understand not, and see ye indeed but perceive not,' &c.

"Now let all these circumstances be placed together —THE PLACE, the holy place of the Holy one; the repetition of the homage, THREE times, Holy, Holy, Holy—the ONE Jehovah of hosts, to whom it was addressed—the plural pronoun used by this ONE Jehovah, US; the declaration of an Evangelist, that on this occasion Isaiah saw the glory of CHRIST; the declaration of St. Paul, that the Lord of Hosts who spoke on that occasion was the HOLY GHOST; and the conclusion will not appear to be without most powerful authority, both circumstantial and declaratory, that the adoration, Holy, Holy, Holy, referred to the Divine Three, in the one essence of the Lord of Hosts. According to the book of Revelation, where '*the Lamb*' is so constantly represented as sitting upon the Divine throne, and where he by name is associated with the Father, as an object of the equal homage and praise of saints and angels; this scene from Isaiah is transferred into the 4th chapter, and the 'living creatures,' the seraphim of the Prophet, are heard in the same strain, and with the same *trine* repetition, saying, *Holy, Holy, Holy*, Lord God Almighty, which *was*, and *is*, and *is to come*."

That this repetition of holy three times expressed the doctrine of the Trinity, was believed and taught by the Jewish Rabbins before Christ, and were it not for the hatred of modern Jews to our Saviour, they undoubtedly would admit the same fact; for it is not an idle repetition or ascription of holiness, but a celebration of the proper holiness and Divinity of the three persons

in the Lord of Hosts. Nor, as St. Jerom justly observes, is that frequent declaration, "I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob," without its meaning; but the threefold repetition intimates the Trinity, and the reiteration of the same name (Elohim) denotes the Unity of substance.

Isaiah xlviii. 16, also makes this threefold distinction and limitation. "And now the Lord God and his Spirit has sent me." Here are three distinct persons engaged in one work and declaration. The person speaking by the Prophet is the person sent, and styles himself, just before, The First and the Last. In a preceding chapter, this First and Last is called Jehovah the Redeemer and Lord of Hosts, (Jehovah Sabaoth,) which last name is applicable, on no account, but to the supreme God. But in the book of Revelation, at several times, we find the Lord Jesus Christ assuming this very name, and saying, I am Alpha and Omega, The First and the Last. Christ, therefore, being the First and the Last, the Sent One of the Father and of the Spirit, and Jehovah Sabaoth or Lord of Hosts, is in himself true and very God, and also a person of co-equal dignity with the other persons in the Godhead. Nor is the grammatical construction of the text to be unnoticed. It is not said the Lord God and his Spirit have sent, in the plural number, but *hath* sent, in the singular; thereby intimating the unity of the Divine nature in the plurality of persons. The mission or sending of Christ by no means degrades the honor of his Divinity: "Even a superior may be sent by an inferior, if the superior chooses to go." How, then, can mission be incompatible with equality? especially since Christ voluntarily covenanted to come down in the behalf of his people; and may be said to have been sent by the Father and the Spirit, because they also voluntarily covenanted that he should come.

6. The form of baptism next presents itself as demonstrative testimony in favor of the Trinity. "'Go

and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,' Matt. xviii. 19. The gospel is every where in Scripture represented as a covenant or conditional offer of eternal salvation from God to man; and baptism was the appointed ordinance by which men were to be admitted into that covenant, by which that offer was made and accepted. This covenant being to be made with God himself, the ordinance, of course, must be performed in his name; but Christ directed that it should be performed in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; and therefore we conclude that God is the same as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Since baptism is to be performed in the name of the Father, the Son, an the Holy Ghost, they must be all three persons; and since no superiority or difference whatever is mentioned in this solemn form of baptism, we conclude that these three persons are all of one substance, power, and eternity. Are we to be baptized in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and is it possible that the Father should be self-existent, eternal, the Lord God Omnipotent; and that the Son, in whose name we are equally baptized, should be a mere man, born of a woman, and subject to all the frailties and imperfections of human nature? or, is it possible that the Holy Ghost, in whose name also we are equally baptized, should be a bare energy or operation, a quality or power, without even personal existence? Our feelings, as well as our reason, revolt from the idea of such disparity.

"This argument will derive great strength from the practice of the early ages, and from the observations which we meet with in several of the ancient fathers relative to it. We learn from Ambrose, that persons at the time of their baptism declared their belief in the three persons of the Holy Trinity, and that they were dipped in the water three times. In his treatise upon the Sacraments, he says, 'Thou wast asked at thy bap-

tism, Dost thou believe in the Father Almighty? and thou didst reply, I believe, and thou wast dipped; and a second time thou wast asked, Dost thou believe in Jesus Christ the Lord? thou didst answer again, I believe, and thou wast dipped; a third time the question was repeated, Dost thou belive in the Holy Ghost? and the answer was, I believe, then thou was dipped a third time.' It is to be noticed, that the belief, here expressed separately, in the three persons of the Trinity, is precisely the same in all. Tertullian, Basil, and Jerom, all mention this practice of trine immersion as ancient; and Jerom says, "We are thrice dipped in the warter, that the mystery of the Trinity may appear to be but one. We are not baptized in the names of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, but in one name, which is God's; and therefore, though we be thrice put under water to represent the mystery of the Trinity, yet it is reputed but one baptism.' Thus the mysterious union of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, as one God, was, in the opinion of the purer ages of the Christian Church, clearly expressed in this form of baptism. By it the primitive Christians understood the Father's gracious acceptance of the atonement offered by the Messiah; the peculiar protection of the Son, our great High Priest and Intercessor; and the readiness of the Holy Ghost to sanctify, to assist, and to comfort all the obedient followers of Christ, confirmed by the visible gift of tongues, of prophecy, and divers other gifts to the first disciples. And as their great Master's instructions evidently distinguished these persons from each other, without any difference in their authority or power, all standing forth as equally dispensing the benefits of Christianity, as equally the objects of the faith required in converts upon admission into the Church, they clearly understood that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, were likewise equally the objects of their grateful worship; this fully appears from

their prayers, doxologies, hymns, and creeds, which are still extant."

7. The doxology at the conclusion of St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians, may be considered as proof in favor of the doctrine of the Trinity. "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with you.' The manner in which Christ and the Holy Ghost are here mentioned, implies that they are persons, for none but persons can confer grace or fellowship; and these three great blessings of grace, love, and fellowship, being respectively prayed for by the inspired Apostle from Jesus Christ, God the Father, and the Holy Ghost, without any intimation of disparity, we conclude that these three persons are equal and Divine. This solemn benediction may therefore be considered as another proof of the Trinity, since it acknowledges the Divinity of Jesus Christ and of the Holy Ghost."

8. This doctrine is most clearly taught in "the following salutation or benediction in the beginning of the Revelation of St. John: 'Grace and peace from Him which is, and which was, and which is to come; and from the seven spirits which are before his throne, and from Jesus Christ.' Here the Father is described by a periphrasis taken from his attribute of eternity; and 'the seven spirits' is a mystical expression for the Holy Ghost, used upon this occasion either because the salutation is addressed to seven Churches, every one of which had partaken of the Spirit, or because seven was a sacred number among the Jews, denoting both variety and perfection, and in this case alluding to the various gifts, administrations, and operations of the Holy Ghost. Since grace and peace are prayed for from these three persons jointly and without discrimination, we infer an equality in their power to dispense these blessings; and we farther conclude that these three persons together constitute the Supreme Being, who is alone the object of prayer, and is alone the Giver of every good and of

every perfect gift. It might be right to remark, that the seven spirits cannot mean angels, since prayers are never in Scripture addressed to angels, nor are blessings ever pronounced in their name. It is unnecessary to quote any of the numerous passages in which the Father is singly called God, as some of them must be recollected by every one, and the Divinity of the Father is not called in question by any sect of Christians." *(Watson.)* As it has been clearly shown from the plainest and most unequivocal Scripture testimony that Christ is God, and that the Holy Ghost is God, it must necessarily follow, since there is but one God, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are this one God.

We therefore see that the Scriptures inform us that there are three distinct persons, styled Father, Son and Spirit, who have distinct offices and energies in the salvation of man; and that each of these three do claim the power and name of the *one* Jehovah; it is obvious, that they are not one in the same respect as they are three, but that there is a real distinction in their inseparable union. One they must be essentially, for there is but one God: Three they must also be hypostatically or personally, or there is neither Father, Son, nor Holy Ghost, and of course the Scriptures are false. The conclusion, therefore, is plain and clear that these three persons are one Godhead, and that the one Godhead (if it may be said) is the common substratum, of the three persons, in which they mutually and inseparably coexist, "without any difference or inequality." To express this intercommunity of the Divine persons, the plural names, ascribed to the Godhead in the Hebrew Bible, appear to have been revealed, and not for the sake of dignity, as some have imagined; because God can receive no honor from mere sounds, but only from what they signify; and he has given us not the least hint that he has used the plural number for any such purpose. And if the Godhead be one only person, with what propriety is the plural number ELOHIM, so often

used, when its own singular ELOAH would in that case be so much more appropriate? Besides, it is a question upon his truth, that he should call himself WE and Us, instead of I and Me, as he frequently does, if he were only one person or subsistence; and it would be representing God as complimenting himself, at the expense of his veracity, in the hollow language of earthly courts and princes.

To render this important point still more undeniable, it may not be improper to produce some proofs from the Scripture, in addition to those already offered, which may evince, that what is said of the Father is said of the Son and Holy Ghost, without reserve or limitation, and that, therefore, they are one in essence though three in person.

God alone, mediately or immediately can raise the dead.

But the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them. John v. 21. So doth the Son whom he will. Ibid. And the Spirit raised and quickened even Christ himself from the dead. 1 Pet. iii. 18. See also Rom. viii. 11. Therefore each of these three must be God; but there is but one God, therefore these three are that ONE GOD.

In Col. ii. 2, the Apostle speaks of the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ. Now, if the God and the Father in this place are one and the same person, it will follow, upon the same ground, that God, and the Father, and Christ, are all one and the same person; for the same copulatives unite the one and the other. The Apostle, likewise, could not have called that a mystery (to acknowledge which, the Collosians were to increase in faith,) which would only imply that these three names meant one and the same thing; for this would have been playing upon terms, which is a sort of folly not to be found in God's word. But if he meant the doctrine of a Trinity, and that the Father, and Christ as to his Divinity, with another person term-

ed God, who, from other Scriptures we learn, must be God the Holy Ghost, are three persons in one Godhead, then he might justly call it a mystery, because it is both a Divine revelation and a matter of faith to the acknowledgment of which it would be the riches of the full assurance of understanding to obtain.

In 1 John v. 7, it is most expressly declared that "there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one." This passage so clearly asserts the doctrine of the Trinity, that Unitarians, in order to evade its force, have been reduced to the necessity of denying its authenticity: as may be seen by referring to Mr. Millard's True Messiah, where, although he styles himself a Bible Christian, he flatly denies that this passage is the word of God, and looks upon it as an interpolation, and in this he is followed by Unitarians generally. But this is not the only text which is thus looked upon by these enemies of the doctrine for which we are now contending; several others share the same fate, while the translation of a large number of texts are called in question. But is it not rather singular that all the texts that are not true, or that are improperly translated, to which Unitarians object, are such as are strongly in favor of the Trinity?

But, that the above text from 1 John is a part of the sacred volume, is evident from several considerations: 1. There must be a flagrant chasm in the sense, if this be removed. It is so necessary to the Apostle's argument, that the argument is not complete without it. And it is abundantly more likely, that these remarkable words should be left out and obliterated in copies made, or kept by the ancient heretics, than that they should have been inserted by the orthodox, who have authorities enough beside for the doctrine expressed in them.

2. Though some have given up this passage as doubtful, yet a great majority of those who are competent to

investigate the subject, are in favor of its truth. Among these may be found Bengelius, who, as Mr. Wesley says, was the most pious, the most judicious, and the most laborious of all modern commentators on the New Testament. He, as well as Mr. Wesley, believed this text to be genuine, for the following reasons:

"1. That though it is wanting in many copies, yet it is found in more; and those copies of the greatest authority. 2. That is cited by a whole train of ancient writers, from the time of St. John to that of Constantine. This argument is conclusive; for they could not have cited it, had it not then been in the sacred canon. 3. That we can easily account for its being, after that time, wanting in many copies, when we remember that Constantine's successor was a zealous Arian, who used every means to promote his bad cause, to spread Arianism throughout the empire; in particular, the erasing this text out of as many copies as fell into his hands. And he so far prevailed, that the age in which he lived is commonly styled *Seculum Arianum*, the Arian age; there being then only one eminent man, who opposed him at the peril of his life. So that it was a proverb, *Athanasius contra mundum:* Athanasius against the world." The text under consideration is therefore genuine, and a part of the Sacred Scriptures; and as such it contains an unanswerable argument in favor of the doctrine of the Trinity; for it expressly declares that, "There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are ONE." 1 John v. 7.

"It has now been shown, that while the Unity of God is to be considered a fundamental doctrine of the Scriptures, laid down with the utmost solemnity, and guarded with the utmost care, by precepts, by threatenings, by promises, by tremendous punishments of polytheism and idolatry among the Jews, the very names of God, as given in the revelation made of himself, have plural forms and are connected with plural

modes of speech; that other indications of plurality are given in various parts of holy writ; and that this plurality is restricted to *three*. On those texts, however, which in their terms denote a plurality and a trinity, the proof does not wholly or chiefly rest." It has been shown that there are two *distinct* persons "associated with God in his perfections and incommunicable glories, and as performing works of unequivocal divine majesty and infinite power, and thus together manifesting that *tri-unity* of the Godhead which the true Church has in all ages adored and magnified. This is the great proof upon which the doctrine rests. The first of these two persons is the *Son*, the second the *Spirit*. Of the former, it" has been shown, "that the titles of Jehovah, Lord, God, King, King of Israel, Redeemer, Saviour, and other names of God, are ascribed to him,—that he is invested with the attributes of eternity, omnipotence, ubiquity, infinite wisdom, holiness, goodness, &c.,—that he was the Leader, the visible King, and the object of the worship of the Jews,—that he forms the great subject of prophecy, and is spoken of in the predictions of the prophets in language, which if applied to men or to angels, would by the Jews have been considered not as sacred but idolatrous, and which, therefore, except that it agreed with their ancient faith, would totally have destroyed the credit of those writings,—that he is eminently known both in the Old Testament and in the New, as the Son of God, an appellative which is sufficiently proved to have been considered as implying an assumption of divinity by the circumstance that, for asserting it, our Lord was condemned to die as a blasphemer by the Jewish Sanhedrim,—that he became incarnate in our nature,—wrought miracles by his own original power, and not, as his servants, in the name of another,—that he authoritatively forgave sin,—that for the sake of his sacrifice, sin is forgiven to the end of the world, and for the sake of that alone,—that he rose from the

dead to seal all these pretensions to divinity,—that he is seated upon the throne of the universe, all power being given to him in heaven and in earth,—that his inspired Apostles exhibit him as the Creator of all things visible and invisible; as the true God and the eternal life; as the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God and our Savior,—that they offer to him the highest worship,—that they trust in him, and command all others to trust in him for eternal life,—that he is the head over all things,—that angels worship him and render him service,—that he will raise the dead at the last day,—judge the secrets of men's hearts, and finally determine the everlasting state of the righteous and the wicked.

"This is the outline of Scriptural testimony as to the *Son*. As to the divine character of the Spirit, it is equally explicit. He too is called Jehovah; Jehovah of Hosts; God. Eternity, omnipotence, ubiquity, infinite wisdom, and other attributes of Deity, are ascribed to him. He is introduced as an agent in the work of the creation, and to him is ascribed the conservation of all living beings. He is the source of the inspiration of Prophets and Apostles; the object of worship; the efficient agent in illuminating, comforting, and sanctifying the souls of men. He makes intercession for the saints; quickens the dead, and, finally, he is associated with the Father and the Son, in the form of baptism into the *one name* of God, and in the apostolic form of benediction, is, equally with them, the source and fountain of grace and blessedness. These decisive points have been established by the express declarations of various passages, both of the Old and New Testament. The argument, therefore, is, that as on the one hand the doctrine of Scripture is, that there is but *one* GOD; and, on the other, that throughout both Testaments, *three* persons are, in unequivocal language, and by unequivocal circumstances, declared to be *divine*; the only conclusion which can harmonize these otherwise

opposite, *contradictory*, and most *misleading* propositions, and declarations, is, that the THREE PERSONS ARE ONE GOD."

Having now, as we consider, shown that the doctrine of the Trinity is based upon the unshaken authority of the word of God, we shall now pass to answer some of the objections which are urged against it. The first and most common objection is, that this doctrine is mysterious and incomprehensible. To this Mr. Wesley very conclusively replies.

"Here is a twofold mistake: 1. We do not require you to believe any mystery in this; whereas you suppose the contrary. But, 2. You do already believe many things which you cannot comprehend.

"To begin with the latter: You do already believe many things which you cannot comprehend. For you believe there is a *sun* over your head. But whether he stands still in the midst of his system, or not only revolves on his own axis, but 'rejoiceth as a giant to run his course;' you cannot comprehend either one or the other: *how* he moves, or *how* he rests. By what power, what natural, mechanical power, is he upheld in the fluid ether? You cannot deny the fact: yet you cannot account for it, so as to satisfy any rational inquirer. You may, indeed, give us the hypothesis of Ptolemy, Tycho Brahe, Copernicus, and twenty more. I have read them over and over: I am sick of them; I care not three straws for them all.

> 'Each new solution but once more affords
> New change of terms, and scaffolding of words:
> In other garb my question I receive,
> And take my doubt the very same I gave.'

Still I insist, the *fact* you believe, you cannot deny; but the *manner* you cannot comprehend.

"You believe there is such a thing as *light*, whether flowing from the sun, or any other luminous body; but you cannot comprehend either its nature, or the manner wherein it flows. How does it move from Jupi-

ter to the earth in eight minutes; two hundred thousand miles in a moment? How do the rays of the candle, brought into the room, instantly disperse into every corner? Again, here are three candles, yet there is but one light. Explain this, and I will explain the three-one God.

"You believe there is such a thing as *air*. It both covers you as a garment, and,

'Wide interfused,
Embraces round this florid earth.'

But can you comprehend how? Can you give me a satisfactory account of its nature, or the cause of its properties? Think only of one, its elasticity: can you account for this? It may be owing to electric fire attached to each particle of it: it may not; and neither you nor I can tell. But if we will not breathe it till we can comprehend it our life is very near its period.

"You believe there is such a thing as *earth*. Here you fix your foot upon it: you are supported by it. But do you comprehend what it is that supports the earth? "Oh, an Elephant;" says a Malabarian philosopher, "and a bull supports him." But what supports the bull? The Indian and the Briton are equally at a loss for an answer. We know it is God that "spreadeth the north over the empty space, and hangeth the earth upon nothing." This is the fact. But how? Who can account for this? Perhaps angelic, but not human creatures.

"I know what is plausibly said concerning the powers of projection and attraction. But spin as fine as we can, matter of fact sweeps away our cobweb hypothesis. Connect the force of projection and attraction how you can, they will never produce a circular motion. The moment the projected steel comes within the attraction of the magnet, it does not form a curve, but drops down.

"You believe you have a soul connected with this house of clay. But can you comprehend how?

What are the ties that unite the heavenly flame with the earthly clod? You understand just nothing of the matter. So it is; but how, none can tell.

"You surely believe you have a *body*, together with your soul, and that each is dependant on the other. Run only a thorn into your hand; immediately pain is felt in your soul. On the other side, is shame felt in your soul? Instantly a blush overspreads your cheek. Does the soul feel fear or violent anger? Presently the body trembles. These also are facts which you cannot deny; nor can you account for them.

"I bring out but one instance more: at the command of your soul, your hand is lifted up. But who is able to account for this? For the connection between the act of the mind, and the outward actions? Nay, who can account for *muscular motion* at all; in any instance of it whatever? When one of the most ingenious physicians in England had finished his lecture upon that head, he added, 'Now, gentlemen, I have told you all the discoveries of our enlightened age; and now, if you understand one jot of the matter, you understand more than I do.'

"The short of the matter is this: those who will not believe any thing but what they can comprehend, must not believe that there is a sun in the firmament; that there is light shining around them; that there is air, though it encompasses them on every side; that there is any earth, though they stand upon it. They must not believe that they have a soul; no, nor that they have a body.

"But, secondly, as strange as it may seem, in requiring you to believe, that 'there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one;' you are not required to believe any mystery. Nay, that great and good man, Dr. Peter Browne, some time Bishop of Cork, has proved at large, that the Bible does not require you to believe any mystery at all. The Bible barely requires you to believe such facts, not the manner of them.

Now the mystery does not lie in the *fact*, but altogether in the *manner*.

"For instance: 'God said, let there be light: and there was light.' I believe it: I believe the plain *fact*. There is no mystery at all in this. The mystery lies in the *manner* of it. But of this I believe nothing at all; nor does God require it of me.

"Again: 'The Word was made flesh.' I believe this fact also. There is no mystery in it; but as to the *manner*, *how* he was made flesh, wherein the mystery lies I know nothing about it; I believe nothing about it: it is no more the object of my faith, than it is of my understanding.

"To apply this to the case before us: 'There are three that bear record in heaven; and these three are one.' I believe this *fact* also, (if I may use the expression,) that God is three and one. But the *manner*, *how*, I do not comprehend; and I do not believe it. Now in this, in the *manner*, lies the mystery; and so it may; I have no concern with it: it is no object of my faith: I believe just so much as God has revealed, and no more. But this, the *manner*, he has not revealed; therefore, I believe nothing about it. But would it not be absurd in me to deny the fact, because I do not understand the manner? That is, to reject *what God has revealed*, because I do not comprehend *what he has not revealed*.

"This is a point much to be observed. There are many things "which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive.' Part of these God hath 'revealed to us by his Spirit:'—'*Revealed*;' that is, unveiled, uncovered: that part he requires us to believe. Part of them he has not revealed: that we need not, and indeed, cannot believe: it is far above, out of our sight.

"Now where is the wisdom of rejecting what is revealed, because we do not understand what is not revealed? Of denying the *fact*, which God has unveiled

because we cannot see the *manner*, which is veiled still?

"Especially when we consider that what God has been pleased to reveal upon this head, is far from being a point of indifference; is a truth of the last importance. It enters into the very heart of Christianity: it lies at the root of all vital religion.

"Unless these three are one, how can 'all men honor the Son, even as they honor the Father?' 'I know not what to do,' says Socinus, in a letter to his friend, 'with my untoward followers: they will not worship Jesus Christ. I tell them, it is written, 'Let all the angels of God worship him.' They answer, 'However that be, if he is not God, we dare not worship him.' For 'it is written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.'"

It is objected that this doctrine is contradictory. This objection is founded upon the supposition that being and person are the same; and upon this begged supposition it is argued that it is a contradiction to say that three persons can exist in the Godhead. But, before this objection will have any force upon the minds of reflecting persons, Unitarians will have to *prove* that person and being *are* the same, and that God cannot exist in three persons. This they have as yet failed of doing. While it has been demonstrated from the sacred Scriptures that there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and that these three are *one*. We are, therefore, not to understand by the word *persons*, when applied to the Godhead, some *separate* existences of a *different* nature, but *united* persons in the *same* nature. The persons in Jehovah are co-equal in all his perfections and attributes; but, with regard to the redemption of man, there is a gradation, or succession, in their respective operations. In these operations, they personally act, yet unitedly concur. The Son, for instance, redeemed by his incarnation and death: But the Father and Spirit were in Christ, co-existent at the same time. The

Spirit also is the Comforter sent from the Father by Christ; and yet Christ, by union of nature with him, is always present with his people, in whom that Spirit dwells with himself, to the end of the world. Thus, God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself; thus Christ is in the Father, and the Father in him; thus God dwelleth in his people, and they in God, because of the Spirit, which (as one with himself) he hath given them. Hence, these divine persons are not merely of *like* essence, but of the *same* essence; not separate existences, but one co-equal and co-eternal existence. They are distinguished from each other in *manifestation*, or *person*, but not in nature, substance, divinity, power, or glory. Viewed in this light, all appearance of contradiction disappears, and the above objection looses all its force. Besides, it should be remembered that there are facts which appear to be contradictory, when compared to other subjects, which in themselves are perfectly consistent.

"In the course of the blood, which runs upwards as well as downwards, through the human system, we witness a fact which is contrary to the general laws of nature, but consistent in itself. It would be a contradiction to say that a man can go ten miles as soon as one; but it would not in speaking of thought, which can ascend to a star as soon as to the top of a spire, or light upon Hindoston as soon as upon the Hudson. And it would be such also, for any one to say I am in the house and the house in me; but it would not be, were he speaking of iron and fire; for the iron may be in the fire and the fire in the iron; nor yet would it be when speaking of God and christians, for the Bible says, "They that dwell in love dwell in God and God in them." If natural things, when compared together, may *appear* to be contradictory, and yet not be *really* so, how obvious is it that the reputed contradiction, that it is said consists in comparing the Trinity with corporeal substances, is visionary and false.

"Our opponents intimate that the contradiction consists in our saying that three times one are one. This is a false representation of our sentiments. Our doctrine requires of us only to maintain that, three, or any other number more than one, *may exist in one.*

"Of the possibility of this, we have examples in very ordinary things. In the study of letters it appears that marks make letters and letters syllables, words, &c. Instance the letter H which is constituted of two strait marks connected by a hyphen. These three marks make one letter; also the English spelling of the word GOD, which depends on three letters for its existence, though it is but one word. These remarks are not made to convey an idea that these things represent the nature of the Deity, for, as I have said, I think it extremely preposterous to attempt a representation of his nature, by any thing in the circle of the universe. He has told us in his word what he is, and it is our duty to believe him: but they are made merely to show that THREE may exist in ONE, and our language of "three PERSONS in ONE GOD," is not so inconsistent as our opposers represent it to be.

"Should it be said, that, if the three persons constitute but one God, it would be improper to apply the word GOD to either of them separately, I would remark, that in the scriptures, the word is applied to them, and what God has said we cannot justly alter; but it is impossible to use it in reference to one without viewing it in relation to the others, who are as really God as the one to whom we directly apply it, as the union of persons, if it exist at all, has a permanent existence, and cannot be dissolved without destroying the very existence of Deity."—*Luckey.*

Unitarians have also objected to this doctrine because the terms which are now used to express it, such as Trinity and person, are not found in the Scriptures. If this proceeded from a real regard to what the Scriptures revealed, it would deserve the more attention; but when

the objection is raised merely for cavillation, as without breach of charity, it may be affirmed has often been the case, it is sufficient to say, that if men will abide only by terms of Scripture, it will be absolutely necessary for them to use the Scripture only in the two languages of Hebrew and Greek, in which they are written. For if there be any force in such an argument, it lies against every translation in the world, because these alter the terms, and sometimes impose a sense upon them which not only is contrary to the sense which other men may affix, but in some instances wide enough from the original. In such a case, there would be no allowable divinity but what might appear in Greek and Hebrew, to the great edification, no doubt, of the common people, who happen to have souls as well as rabbies and philosophers, and who in general are at least as desirous of their salvation. The truth is, the terms used in this and other cases would not offend, if the things which the terms signify were not disagreeable to those who make the above objection. We know, as well as these objectors, that the words *trinity, incarnation, person, essence,* and such like, are not to be found in the Bible; but we also know that the truths which these words relate to are not only to be found there, but are the very sum and substance of it. If these terms convey the notion of these truths, they answer the use of all terms, which is to communicate the knowledge of things. And as to the terms themselves, they were first employed in opposition to the various heretics by the fathers of the Church, for a clearer and more full expression of their doctrines, and have been very properly retained to this day.

CHAPTER VI.

THE ORIGINAL STATE OF MAN.

Having, in the preceding chapters, confined ourselves mostly to the all important subject of the Trinity, we now pass from that to another, in which we are all in like manner deeply interested, viz: the Character and Condition of Man. In the present chapter, however, we shall confine ourselves to a consideration of his character in his primeval state, in which it will be our object to show that he was created holy; a point which is denied by many Unitarians.

1. "Man was the effect of a holy cause. God created man; and as man was passive, and not active, in his own creation, he could have possessed no nature, powers, nor even tendencies of powers, which he did not receive from the plastic hand of his Creator. God imparted to man all that he possessed when he first awoke to conscious being, even the first breath he drew; hence if man contained in his nature any moral evil, God must have been its author. Man's body, which was formed of the earth, must have been a lifeless and irrational form of matter; and could not have possessed moral quality, before it was animated by a rational soul; all, therefore, that man possessed in his first existence that was moral was imparted to him when God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and constituted him a living soul; therefore, if man was morally corrupt, or contained in his nature any propensity to evil, it must have been infused by Jehovah's breath! Now as God is holy, nothing but holiness could have proceeded from him; man, therefore, must have been holy in his first existence, as he came from the hands of his Divine Author.

2. "'God created man in his own image.' Gen. i. 27. By the image of God, in this text, we understand the moral likeness of God, consisting in righteousness and true holiness. No other consistent explanation can be given of the subject. It would be absurd to say that the image of God consists in bodily form, for if form be applied to the Deity, such form must be bounded by geometrical limits; which is opposed to infinity and omnipresence, perfections which are essential to the Supreme Being. Nor can it be consistently said, that the image of God wherein man was created, consisted in his having authority over the other creatures, which God created, as his vicegerent on earth, for this was only a circumstance in his being, and not an image in which he was made. Gen. i. 26: 'God said let us make man in our own image, and let him have dominion,' &c. Here man's creation in the image of God, and his having dominion, are marked as two distinct circumstances; the one refers to his creation, the other to the design of his creation, or to the circumstances in which he was placed after he was created. Man was created in the image of God, but he did not possess dominion until after he was created; therefore, the image of God in which he was created could not have consisted in his having authority over this lower world, as God's vicegerent, because the image existed before he possessed the authority: he was created in the image, but the authority was given him *after* he was created. It must appear equally absurd to contend, as some have, that the image of God in which man was created consisted *exclusively* in the immortality of his soul. There is no evidence that God's immortality consists in his image any more than his justice, holiness, or any other perfection of his nature. Immortality is one of the Divine perfections, and if one of the perfections of God be embraced in the image which he stamped upon his rational offspring, it is reasonable to suppose that every communicable perfection of the Divine nature must be

embraced to render the image complete; wherefore we conclude, that as man was created in the Divine image, he received from the plastic hand that formed him, the stamp of every communicable perfection of the Divine nature; nor is holiness the least prominent among these perfections, as God has revealed himself in the Bible. But this view of the subject does not depend upon abstract speculations upon the perfections of God, for it is based on the declarations of his word. Eph. iv. 24: 'And that ye put on the new man which, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness.' By the new man which we are here exhorted to put on, we understand the true Christian character. This, the text informs us, is created after God, i. e., after the likeness or image of God, and this is 'in righteousness and true holiness.' The image of God, then, consists in righteousness and true holiness; and as man was created in this image, he must have been holy; not merely free from unholiness, but postively holy; for he shone in the Divine image, which consists in righteousness and *true* holiness.

3. "We infer man's primitive holiness from the seal of the Divine approbation which was set upon him by his Maker. Gen. i. 31. 'And God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was *very good*.' As this was spoken of all the works of God, its meaning must be, that every thing was very good of its kind; the world was a good world, and the man that was created to people it was a good man. Now as man was a rational being, a moral agent, and destined to lead the career of this vast world, when God pronounced him good, it must have been with reference to him, such as he was, a moral being; he must, therefore, have been good in a moral sense. This clearly proves that man was not only free from all moral evil, but that he was positively good, or possessed real moral virtue. If, as some now assert, all moral good and moral evil consist in voluntary action, man being neither holy nor unholy

until he puts forth his volitions, the text under consideration, which asserts that he was very good, cannot be true; for in such case, it would be as correct to assert that he was very bad, as it would to pronounce him good. It must be perfectly plain that to assert that man was very good, because he was free from all moral evil, would be no more true than it would be to declare that he was very bad because he possessed no moral holiness.

4. "One quotation from the pen of inspiration shall close the subject of man's primitive holiness. Eccl. vii. 29: 'Lo this only have I found, that God hath made man upright, but they sought out many inventions.' That this text relates to man's moral rectitude, and not to the erect posture of his body, appears from two considerations.

"This is the sense in which the word upright is uniformly employed in the Scriptures. Ps. vii. 10: 'My defence is in God, who saveth the upright in heart.' Prov. xi. 9: 'The righteousness of the upright shall deliver him.' See, also, Ps. xi. 7; xviii. 23, 25; xix. 13; xxxvii. 37; Prov. xi. 20; xii. 6. The above, to which many more references might be added, are sufficient to show that the term upright is uniformly used to signify moral rectitude.

"In the text under consideration the inspired writer represents his discovery of the fact that God made man upright, to be the fruit of labored investigation, which could not be the case if he alluded to the upright posture of his body. It would reflect no great honor on the intellect of the inspired penman to understand him as saying, that he had numbered a thousand persons, one by one, examining each, to learn that God had created man to stand erect in opposition to the quadruped race. It is clear, then, that God made man upright in a moral sense, and if so, he must have been free from moral evil on one hand, and possessed moral virtue on the other."—*Lee.*

CHAPTER VII.

THE FALL OF MAN.

As Unitarians generally deny the fall of man, it will be our object in this chapter to establish this important doctrine of the Christian system; and, in the first place, in support of this doctrine, we urge the Mosaic account of this event, which is, "that a garden having been planted by the Creator, for the use of man, he was placed in it, 'to dress it and to keep it;' that in this garden two trees were specially distinguished, one as 'the tree of life,' the other as 'the tree of the knowledge of good and evil;' that from eating of the latter, Adam was restrained by positive interdict, and by the penalty, "in the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die;' that the serpent, who was more subtle than any beast of the field, tempted the woman to eat, by denying that death would be the consequence, and by assuring her that her eyes and her husband's eyes 'would be opened,' and that they would 'be as gods, knowing good and evil;' that the woman took of the fruit, gave it to her husband who also ate; that for this act of disobedience, they were expelled from the garden, made subject to death, and laid under other maledictions.

"That this history should be the subject of much criticism" by Unitarians, is not a matter of surprise; for "taken in its natural and obvious sense, along with the comments of the subsequent Scriptures, it teaches the doctrines of the existence of an evil, tempting, invisible spirit, going about seeking whom he may deceive and devour; of the introduction of a state of moral corruptness into human nature, which has been transmitted to all men; and of a vicarious atonement for sin," to all of which Unitarians stand opposed; they there-

fore endeavor to evade the argument founded upon this history in favor of the fall of man, by resolving the part now under consideration into an allegory, or an instructive fable; but "no writer of true history would mix plain matter of fact with allegory in one continued narrative, without any intimation of a transition from one to the other. If, therefore, any part of this narrative be matter of fact, no part is allegorical. On the other hand, if any part be allegorical, no part is naked matter of fact; and the consequence of this will be, that every thing in every part of the whole narrative must be allegorical. If the formation of the woman out of the man be allegory, the woman must be an allegorical woman. The man therefore must be an allegorical man; for of such a man only the allegorical woman will be a meet companion. If the man is allegorical, his Paradise must be an allegorical garden; the trees that grew in it, allegorical trees; the rivers that watered it, allegorical rivers; and thus we may ascend to the very beginning of creation; and conclude, at last, that the heavens are allegorical heavens, and the earth an allegorical earth. Thus the whole history of the creation will be an allegory, of which the real subject is not disclosed; and in this absurdity, the scheme of allegorizing ends."—*Horsley.*

"But that the account of Moses is to be taken as a matter of real history, and according to its literal import, is established by two considerations, against which as being facts nothing can successfully be urged. The first is, that the account of the fall of the first pair is a part of a continuous history. The creation of the world, of man, of woman; the planting of the garden of Eden, and the placing of man there; the duties and prohibitions laid upon him; his disobedience; his expulsion from the garden; the subsequent birth of his children, their lives and actions, and those of their posterity, down to the flood; and, from that event, to the life of Abraham, are given in the same plain and un-

adorned narrative, brief, but yet simple, and with no intimation at all, either from the elevation of the style or otherwise, that a fable or allegory is in any part introduced. If this, then, be the case, and the evidence of it lies upon the very face of the history, it is clear, that if the account of the fall be excerpted from the whole narrative as allegorical, any subsequent part, from Abel to Noah, from Noah to Abraham, from Abraham to Moses, may be excerpted for the same reason, which is neither more nor less than this, that it does not agree with the theological opinions of the interpreter; and thus the whole of the Pentateuch may be rejected as a history, and converted into a fable. One of these consequences must, therefore, follow, either that the account of the fall must be taken as history, or the historical character of the whole five books of Moses must be unsettled; and if none but infidels will go to the latter consequence, then no one who admits the Pentateuch to be a true history generally, can consistently refuse to admit the story of the fall of the first pair to be a narrative of real events.

"The other indisputable fact to which I have just now adverted, as establishing the literal sense of the history, is that, as such, it is referred to and reasoned upon in various parts of Scripture.

"Job xx. 4, 5: 'Knowest thou not this of old, since man was placed upon earth, that the triumphing of the wicked is short, and the joy of the hypocrite but for a moment?' The first part of the quotation 'might as well have been rendered, since Adam was placed on the earth. There is no reason to doubt but that this passage refers to the fall and the first sin of man. The date agrees, for the knowledge here taught is said to arise from facts as old as the first placing of man upon earth, and the sudden punishment of the iniquity corresponds to the Mosaic account—the triumphing of the wicked is short, his joy but for a moment.'

"Job xxxi. 33: 'If I covered my transgression as Adam, by hiding my inquity in my bosom.'

"Job xv. 14: 'What is man, that he should be clean? and he that is born of a woman, that he should be righteous?' Why not clean? Did God make woman or man unclean at the beginning? If he did, the expostulation would have been more apposite, and much stronger, had the true cause been assigned, and Job had said, 'How canst thou expect cleanness in man, whom thou *createdst* unclean?' But, as the case now stands, the expostulation has a plain reference to the introduction of vanity and corruption by the sin of the woman, and is an evidence that this ancient writer was sensible of the evil consequences of the fall upon the whole race of man. 'Eden' and 'garden of the Lord' are also frequently referred to in the Prophets. We have the 'tree of life' mentioned several times in the Proverbs and in the Revelation. 'God,' says Solomon, 'made man upright.' The enemies of Christ and his Church are spoken of, both in the Old and New Testaments, under the names of 'the serpent,' and 'the dragon;' and the habit of the serpent to lick the dust is also referred to by Isaiah.

"If the history of the fall, as recorded by Moses, were an allegory, or any thing but a literal history, several of the above allusions would have no meaning; but the matter is put beyond all possible doubt in the New Testament, unless the same culpable liberties be taken with the interpretation of the words of our Lord and of St. Paul as with those of the Jewish lawgiver. Our Lord says, Matt. xix. 4, 5, 'Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning, made them male and female; and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh?' This is an argument on the subject of divorces, and its foundation rests upon two of the facts recorded by Moses. 1. That God made at first but two human beings, from whom all the

rest have sprung. 2. That the intimacy and indissolubility of the marriage relation rests upon the formation of the woman from the man; for our Lord quotes the words in Genesis, where the obligation of man to cleave to his wife is immediately connected with that circumstance. 'And Adam said, This is now bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man. *Therefore* shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh.' This is sufficiently in proof that both our Lord and the Pharisees considered this early part of the history of Moses as a narrative; for otherwise, it would neither have been a reason, on his part, for the doctrine which he was inculcating, nor have had any force of conviction as to them. 'In Adam,' says the Apostle Paul, 'all die;' 'by one man sin entered into the world.' 'But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ.' In the last passage, the instrument of the temptation is said to be a serpent, and Eve is represented as being first seduced, according to the account in Genesis. This St. Paul repeats, in 1 Tim. ii. 13, 14. 'Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, (first, or immediately,) but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.' And offers this as the reason of his injunction, 'Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection.' When, therefore, it is considered that these passages are introced not for rhetorical illustration, or in the way of classical quotation, but are made the basis of grave reasonings, which embody some of the most important doctrines of the Christian revelation; and of important social duties and points of Christian order and decorum; it would be to charge the writers of the New Testament with the grossest absurdity, with even culpable and unworthy trifling, to suppose them to argue from the history of the fall as a narrative, when they

knew it to be an allegory; and if we are, therefore, compelled to allow that it was understood as a real history by our Lord and his inspired Apostles, those speculations of modern critics, which convert it into a parable, stand branded with their true character of infidel and semi-infidel termerity."—*Watson.*

Having thus established the fall of the first man, we now propose proving that all men are born into the world with a corrupt or depraved nature.

I. "We argue the general corruption of human nature from the fall and corruption of the first man, from whom all men have received their existence by way of natural descent.

"We have shown, in the preceding chapter, that the first man was created in righteousness and true holiness, that he bore the impress of the hand that made him, and shone in the likeness of his divine Author. Now as righteousness and true holiness constituted the moral character or nature of man, as he came from the hand of his Creator, it must follow that this divine image was designed for his descendants, and would have been communicated to them, had he not sinned and lost it himself, while all men were yet in his loins. If, then, the image of God, wherein the first man was created, was designed to have been transmitted to his offspring, it must appear reasonable that nothing short of a full possession of this image can answer the claims of the law of our creation; for it would be absurd to say that God created man in a higher state of moral perfection than is necessary to answer the claims, and secure the glory of the moral government which he exercises over the human family; or that he bestowed on man a degree of moral holiness, which he did not secure from desecration by the direct interposition of moral obligation, or which might be lost or squandered on the part of man, without incurring moral guilt. It is clear, from this, that any state of human nature which comes short of that moral perfection, or that divine image

which God bestowed, when he created man, must be regarded as a lapsed state, coming short of that righteousness which the perfect law of our Creator requires, and consequently, a sinful state, 'for all unrighteousness is sin.' If, then, a want of the image of God, which consists in righteousness and true holiness, constitutes a fallen and sinful state, it only remains to show farther, that man does not by nature now possess this divine image. Now, when Adam sinned, he must have lost the image of his Maker; for it would be absurd to suppose that the image of God, consisting in righteousness and true holiness, could be possessed by man, and he be a sinner at the same time, guilty before God, and a subject of divine punishment. As well might it be said, that God could consistently condemn and pour a divine curse upon his own image! As well might it be said that sin and holiness once formed a harmonious alliance! That Adam was righteous and truly holy, and unrighteous, polluted, and guilty, at the same time. It is certain, then, that Adam could not have retained the image of his Maker after he sinned, and being destitute of it himself, he could not communicate it to his offspring; for no being can communicate to another that which he does not himself possess."—*Lee.*

II. We argue the hereditary depravity of human nature from the following facts, for which it is impossible to assign any cause, upon the hypothesis of man's natural innocence:

1. "That in all ages great, and even general wickedness has prevailed among those large masses of men which are called nations.

"So far as it relates to the immediate descendants of Adam before the flood; to all the nations of the highest antiquity; to the Jews throughout every period of their history, down to their final dispersion; and to the empires and other states whose history is involved in theirs; we have the historical evidence of Scripture,

and much collateral evidence also from their own historians.

"To what does this evidence go, but to say the least, the actual depravity of the majority of mankind in all these ages and among all these nations? As to the race before the flood, a murderer sprang up in the first family, and the world became increasingly corrupt, until 'God saw that the wickedness of man was great, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually;' 'that all flesh had corrupted their way upon earth;' and that 'the earth was filled with violence through them.' Only Noah was found righteous before God; and because of the universal wickedness, a wickedness which spurned all warning, and resisted all correction, the flood was brought upon the world of the ungodly, as a testimony of Divine anger.

"The same course of increasing wickedness is exhibited in the sacred records as taking place after the flood. The building of the tower of Babel was a wicked act, done by general concert, before the division of nations; this we know from its having excited the Divine displeasure, though we know not in what the particular crime consisted. After the division of nations, the history of the times of Abraham, Lot, Jacob, Joseph, and Moses sufficiently show that idolatry, injustice, oppression, and gross sensualities characterized the people of Canaan, Egypt, and every other country mentioned in the Mosaic narrative.

"The obstinate inclination of the Israelites to idolatry, through all ages to the Babylonish captivity, and the general prevalence of vice among men, is acknowledged in every part of the Old Testament. Their moral wickedness after their return from Babylon, when they no longer practiced idolatry, and were, therefore, delivered from that most fruitful source of crime, may be collected from the writers of the Old Testament who lived after that event; and their general corruption in the time of our Lord and his Apos-

tles stands forth with disgusting prominence in the writings of Josephus, their own historian.

"As to all other ancient nations, of whom we have any history, the accounts agree in stating the general prevalence of practical immorality and of malignant and destructive passions; and, if we had no such acknowledgments from themselves; if no such reproaches were mutually cast upon each other; if history were not, as indeed it is, a record of crimes, in action and in detail; and if poets, moralists, and satirists did not all give their evidence, by assuming that men were influenced by general principles of vice, expressing themselves in particular modes in different ages, the following great facts would prove the case:

"The fact of GENERAL RELIGIOUS ERROR, and that in the very fundamental principles of religion, such as the existence of one only God; which universal corruption of doctrine among all the ancient nations mentioned above, shows both indifference to truth and hostility against it, and therefore proves, at least, the *general* corruption of men's hearts, of which even indifference to religious truth is a sufficient indication.

"The universal prevalence of IDOLATRY, which not only argues great debasement of intellect, but deep wickedness of heart, because, in all ages, idolatry has been more or less immoral in its influence, and generally grossly so, by leading directly to sanguinary and impure practices.

"The prevalence of SUPERSTITION wherever idolatry has prevailed, and often when that has not existed, is another proof. The essence of this evil is the transfer of fear and hope from God to real or imaginary creatures and things, and so is a renunciation of allegiance to God, as the Governor of the world, and a practical denial either of his being or his providence.

"Aggressive WARS, in the guilt of which all nations and all uncivilized tribes have been, in all ages involved,

and which necessarily suppose hatred, revenge, cruelty, injustice, and ambition.

"In all Heathen nations, idolatry, superstition, fraud, oppression, and vices of almost every description show the general state of society to be exceedingly and even destructively corrupt; and though Mohammedan nations escape the charge of idolatry, yet pride, avarice, oppression, injustice, cruelty, sensuality, and gross superstition, are all prevalent among them.

"The case of Christian nations, though in them immorality is more powerfully checked than in any other, and many bright and influential examples of the highest virtue are found among their inhabitants, sufficiently proves that the majority are corrupt and vicious in their habits. The impiety and profaneness; the neglect of the fear and worship of God; the fraud and villany continually taking place in the commerce of mankind; the intemperance of various kinds which is found among all classes; the oppression of the poor; and many other evils, are in proof of this; and, indeed, we may confidently conclude, that no advocate of the natural innocence of man will contend that the *majority* of men, even in this country, are actually virtuous in their external conduct, and much less that the fear and love of God and habitual respect to his will, which are, indeed, the only principles which can be deemed to constitute a person righteous, influence the people at large, or even any very large proportion of them.

"The fact, then, is established, which was before laid down, that men in all ages and in all places have, at least, been generally wicked.

"2. The second fact to be accounted for is, the strength of that tendency to the wickedness which we have seen to be general.

"The strength of the corrupting principle, whatever it may be, is marked by two circumstances.

"The first is, the greatness of the crimes to which men have abandoned themselves.

"If the effects of the corrupt principle had only been manifested in trifling errors, and practical infirmities, a softer view of the moral condition in which man is born into the world might, probably, have been admitted; but in the catalogue of human crimes, in all ages, and among great numbers of all nations, but more especially among those nations where there has been the least control of religion, and, therefore, where the *natural* dispositions of men have exhibited themselves under the simplest and most convincing evidence, we find frauds, oppressions, faithlessness, barbarous cruelties and murders, unfeeling oppressions, falsehoods, every kind of uncleanness, uncontrolled anger, deadly hatred and revenge, as to their fellow creatures, and proud and scornful rebellion against GOD.

"The second is, the number and influence of the checks and restraints against which this tide of wickedness has urged on its almost resistless and universal course.

"It has opposed itself against the law of God, in some degree found among all men; consequently, against the checks and remorse of conscience; against a settled conviction of the evil of most of the actions indulged in, which is shown by their having been blamed in others (at least whenever any have suffered by them) by those who themselves have been in the habit of committing them.

"Against the restraints of human laws, and the authority of magistrates; for, in all ancient states, the moral corruption continued to spread until they were politically dissolved, society not being able to hold itself together, in consequence of the excessive height to which long indulgence had raised passion and appetite.

"Against the provision made to check human vices by that judicial act of the Governor of the world, by which he shortened the life of man, and rendered it uncertain, and, at the longest, brief.

"Against another provision made by the Governor of the world, in part with the same view, *i. e.* the dooming of man to earn his sustenance by labor, and thus providing for the occupation of the greater portion of time in what was innocent, and rendering the means of sensual indulgences more scanty, and the opportunities of actual immorality more limited.

"Against the restraints put upon vice by rendering it, by the constitution and the very nature of things, the source of misery of all kinds and degrees, national, domestic, personal, mental, and bodily.

"Against the terrible judgments which God has, in all ages, brought upon wicked nations and notorious individuals, many of which visitations were known and acknowledged to be the signal manifestations of his displeasure against their vices.

"Against those counteractive and reforming influences of the revelations of the will and mercy of GOD, which at different times have been vouchsafed to the world: as, against the light and influence of the patriarchal religion before the giving of the law; against the Mosaic institute, and the warnings of prophets among the Jews; against the religious knowledge which was transmitted from them among heathen nations connected with their history, at different periods; against the influence of Christianity when introduced into the Roman empire, and when transmitted to the Gothic nations, by all of whom it was grossly corrupted; and against the control of the same Divine religion in our own country, where it is exhibited in its purity, and in which the most active endeavors are adopted to enlighten and correct society.

"It is impossible to consider the number and power of these checks without acknowledging, that those principles in human nature which give rise to the mass of moral evil which actually exists, and has always existed since men began to multiply upon the earth, are most powerful and formidable in their tendency.

"3. The third fact is, that the seeds of the vices which exist in society may be discovered in children in their earliest years; selfishness, envy, pride, resentment, deceit, lying, and often cruelty; and so much is this the case, so explicitly is this acknowledged by all, that it is the principal object of the moral branch of education to restrain and correct those evils, both by coercion, and by diligently impressing upon children, as their faculties open, the evil and mischief of all such affections and tendencies.

"4. The fourth fact is, that every man is conscious of a natural tendency to many evils.

"These tendencies are different in degree and in kind. In some they move to ambition, and pride, and excessive love of honor; in others, to anger, revenge, and implacableness; in others, to cowardice, meanness, and fear; in others, to avarice, care, and distrust; in others, to sensuality and prodigality. But where is the man who has not his peculiar constitutional tendency to some evil in one of these classes? But there are, also, evil tendencies common to all. These are, to love creatures more than God; to forget God; to be indifferent to our obligations to him; to regard the opinions of men more than the approbation of God; to be more influenced by the visible things which surround us than by the invisible God, whose eye is ever upon us, and by that invisible state to which we are all hastening.

"5. The fifth fact is, that, even after a serious wish and intention has been formed in men to renounce these views, and 'to live righteously, soberly, and godly,' as becomes creatures made to glorify God and on their trial for eternity, strong and constant resistance is made by the passions, appetites, and inclinations of the heart at every step of the attempt.

"This is so clearly a matter of universal experience, that, in the moral writings of every age and country, and in the very phrases and turns of all languages, vir-

tue is associated with difficulty, and represented under the notion of a warfare. Virtue has always, therefore, been represented as the subject of acquirement; and resistance of evil as being necessary to its preservation. It has been made to consist in self-rule, which is, of course, restraint upon opposite tendencies; the mind is said to be subject to diseases, and the remedy for these diseases is placed in something outward to itself—in religion, among inspired men; in philosophy, among the Heathen.

"This constant struggle against the rules and resolves of virtue has been acknowledged in all ages, and among Christian nations more especially, where, just as the knowledge of what the Divine law requires is diffused, the sense of the difficulty of approaching to its requisitions is felt; and in proportion as the efforts made to conform to it are sincere, is the despair which arises from repeated and constant defeats, when the aid of Divine grace is not called in. 'O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?'

"These five facts, above enumerated:—1. The *general* corruption of manners in all times and countries. 2. The strength of the tendency in man to evil. 3. The early appearance of the principles of various vices in children. 4. Every man's consciousness of a natural tendency in his mind to one or more evils. 5. That general resistance to virtue in the heart, which renders education, influence, watchfulness, and conflict necessary to counteract the force of evil. These facts, which, it is presumed, cannot be denied, and which have the confirmation of history and experience are to be accounted for.

"That they are easily and fully accounted for by the Scriptural doctrine is obvious. The fountain is bitter, and the tree is corrupt; the bitter stream and the bad fruit are, therefore, the natural consequences. But the advocates of man's natural innocence have no means of ac-

counting for these moral phenomena, except by referring them to bad example and a vicious education.

"Let us take the first. To account for general wickedness, they refer to general example.

"But, 1. This does not account for the introduction of moral wickedness. The children of Adam were not born until after the repentance of our first parents and their restoration to the Divine favor. They appear to have been his devout worshippers, and to have had access to his 'presence,' the visible glory of the Schechinah. From what example, then, did Cain learn malice, hatred, and, finally, murder? Example will not account, also, for the too common fact of the children of highly virtuous parents becoming immoral; for, since the examples *nearest* to them and constantly present with them are good examples, if the natural disposition were as good as this hypothesis assumes, the good example always present ought to be more influential than bad examples at a distance, and only occasionally seen or heard of.

"2. If men are naturally disposed to good, or only not indisposed to it, it is not accounted for, on this hypothesis, how bad example should have become general, that is, how men should generally have become wicked.

"If the natural disposition be more in favor of good than evil, then there ought to have been more good than evil in the world, which is contradicted by fact; if there had been only an indifference in our minds to good and evil, then, at least, the quantum of vice and virtue in society ought to have been pretty equally divided, which is also contrary to fact; and also it ought to have followed from this, that at least all the children of virtuous persons would have been virtuous: that, for instance, the descendants of Seth would have followed in succession the steps of their righteous forefathers, though the children of Cain (passing by the difficulty of his own lapse,) should have become vicious. On

neither supposition can the existence of a *general* evil example in the world be accounted for. It ought not to have existed, and if so, the general corruption of mankind cannot be explained by it.

"3. This very method of explaining the general viciousness of society does itself suppose the power of bad example; and, indeed, in this it agrees with universal opinion. All the moralists of public and domestic life, all professed teachers, all friends of youth, all parents have repeated their cautions against evil society to those whom they wished to preserve from vice. The writings of moralists, Heathen and inspired, are full of these admonitions, and they are embodied in the proverbs and wise traditional sayings of all civilized nations. But the very force of evil example can only be accounted for, by supposing a *proneness* in youth to be corrupted by it. Why should it be more influential than good example, a fact universally acknowledged, and so strongly felt that, for one person preserved by the sole influence of a good example, every body expects that a great number would be corrupted by an evil one? But if the hypothesis of man's natural innocence were true, this ought not to be expected as a probable, much less as a certain result. Bad example would meet with resistance from a good nature; and it would be much more difficult to influence by bad examples than by good ones.

"4. Nor does example account for the other facts in the above enumeration. It does not account for that *strong* bias to evil in men, which, in all ages, has borne down the most powerful restraints; for from this tendency that corrupt general example has sprung, which is alleged as the cause of it; and it must, therefore, have existed previously, because the general example, that is, the general corrupt practice of men is its effect. We cannot, in this way, account for the early manifestation of wrong principles, tempers, and affections in children; since they appear at an age when example

can have little influence, and even when the surrounding examples are good, as well as when they are evil. Why, too, should virtue always be found more or less a conflict? so that self-government and self-resistance are, in all cases, necessary for its preservation. The example of others will not account for this; for mere example can only influence when it is approved by the judgment; but here is a case in which evil is not approved, in which 'whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are pure,' are approved, desired, and cultivated; and yet the resistance of the heart to the judgment is so powerful, that a constant warfare and a strict command are necessary to perseverance.

"Let us, then, see whether a bad education, the other cause, usually alleged to account for these facts, will be more successful.

"1. This cause will no more account for the introduction of passions so hateful as those of Cain, issuing in a fratricide so odious, into the family of Adam, than will example. As there was no example of these evils in the primeval family, so certainly there was no education which could incite and encourage them. We are, also, left still without a reason why, in well-ordered and religious families, where education and the example, too, is good, so many instances of their inefficacy should occur. If bad education corrupts a naturally well-disposed mind, then a good education ought still more powerfully to affect it, and give it a right tendency. It is allowed, that good example and good education are, in many instances, effectual; but we can account for them, without giving up the doctrine of the natural corruption of the heart. It is, however, impossible for those to account for those failures of both example and instruction which often take place, since, on the hypothesis of man's natural innocence and good disposition, they ought never to occur, or, at least, but in very rare cases, and when some singular counteracting external causes happen to come into operation.

"2. We may also ask, how it came to pass, unless there were a predisposing cause to it, that education, as well as example, should have been generally bad? Of education, indeed, men are usually more careful than of example. The lips are often right when the life is wrong; and many practise evil who will not go so far as to teach it. If human nature, then, be born pure, or, at worst, equally disposed to good and evil, then the existence of a generally corrupting system of education, in all countries and among all people, cannot be accounted for. We have an effect either contrary to the assigned cause, or one to which the cause is not adequate—it is the case of a pure fountain sending forth corrupt streams; or that of a stream which, if turbid, has a constant tendency to defecation, and yet becomes still more muddy as it flows along its course.

"3. It is not, however, the fact, that education is directly and universally so corrupting a cause as to account for the depravity of mankind. In many instances it has been defective; it has often inculcated false views of interest and honor; it has fostered prejudices, and even national, though not social, hatreds; but it has only in few cases been employed to teach those vices into which men have commonly fallen. In fact, education, in all countries, has been, in no small degree, opposed to vice; and, as the majority of the worst people among us would shudder to have their children instructed in the vices which they themselves practise, so, in the worst nations of antiquity, the characters of schoolmasters were required to be correct, and many principles and maxims of a virtuous kind were, doubtless, taught to children.

"4. To come to the other facts which must be accounted for, education is placed upon the same ground in the argument as example. The early evil dispositions in children cannot thus be explained, for they appear before education commences; nor does any man refer to education his propensity to constitutional sins;

the resistance he often feels to good in his heart; his proneness to forget God, and to be indifferent to spiritual and eternal objects; all these he feels to be opposed to those very principles which his judgment approves, and with which it was furnished by education.

"It is only, then, by the Scriptural account of the natural and hereditary corruption of the human race, commonly called original sin, that these facts are fully accounted for; and as the facts themselves cannot be denied," *(Watson,)* it must follow that man is fallen, and now possesses a corrupt and sinful nature, from which all his unholy passions and actions flow.

III. If human nature is not depraved and sinful, but perfectly holy, a doctrine for which the compiler of this work has heard many Unitarians contend, especially the Rev. James Hayes, who advocated it, in the controversy alluded to on the 37th page of this work; a doctrine, too, which may be found in the writings of all Unitarians who have written upon this subject, then infants do not stand in need of the merits of Christ, for they have no sin for which to atone; consequently, they must be saved independent of the blood of the Saviour, and, therefore, can never join in the enraptured song of the redeemed, "unto him that loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood—to him be glory both now and forever." There must, therefore, if the doctrine of original sin, or hereditary, be denied, be a jar in the notes of Glory. But this cannot possibly be. Therefore, the doctrine of the natural corruption of human nature must be true.

"IV. The death and sufferings to which children are subject, is a proof that all men, from their birth, are 'constituted,' as the Apostle has it, and treated as 'sinners.' An innocent creature may die; no one disputes that; but to die was not the original law of our species, and the Scriptures refer death solely to sin as its cause. Throughout the sacred writings, too, it is represented as a penalty, as an evil of the highest kind;

and it is in vain to find out ingenious reasons to prove it a blessing to mankind. They prove nothing against the directly opposite character which has been stamped upon death and the suffering of moral disease, by the testimony of God. On the hypothesis of man's natural innocence, the death of the innocent is not to be reconciled to any known attribute of God, to any manifested principle of his moral government; but on that of his natural corruptness and federal relation to Adam it is explained: it is a declaration of God's hatred of sin; a proclamation of the purity and inflexibility of his law; while the connection of this state, with the provisions of the covenant of grace, present 'mercy and truth meeting together, righteousness and peace kissing each other.'

V. We argue the doctrine of hereditary depravity from the express testimony of sacred writ.

"It is probable, though great stress need not be laid upon it, that when it is said, Gen. v. 3, that 'Adam begat a son in his own likeness,' that there is an implied opposition between the likeness of God, in which Adam was made, and the likeness of Adam, in which his son was begotten. It is not said that he begat a son in the likeness of God; a very appropriate expression, if Adam had not fallen, and if human nature had sustained, in consequence, no injury; and such a declaration was apparently called for, had this been the case, to show what would have been a very important fact, that notwithstanding the personal delinquency of Adam, yet human nature itself had sustained no deterioration, but was propagated without corruption. On the contrary, it is said that he begat a son in his own likeness; which, probably, was mentioned on purpose to exclude the idea, that the image of God was hereditary in man.

"In Gen. vi. 5, it is stated, as the cause of the flood, that 'God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts

of his heart was only evil continually.' Here, it is true, that the actual moral state of the antediluvians may only be spoken of, and that the text does not directly prove the doctrine of hereditary depravity: yet is the actual wickedness of man traced up to the heart, as its natural source, in a manner which seems to intimate that the doctrine of the natural corruption of man was held by the writer, and by that his mode of expression was influenced. The heart of man is here put for his soul. This God had formed with a marvellous thinking power. But so is his soul debased, that every imagination, figment, formation of the thoughts of it, is evil, only evil, continually evil. Whatever it forms within itself as a thinking power, is an evil formation. Therefore all men's actual wickedness springs from the evil formation of their corrupt heart, consequently, they are sinners from birth, or naturally depraved.

"That this was the theological sentiment held and taught by Moses, and implied even in this passage, is made very clear by Gen. viii. 21: 'I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake: for the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth; neither will I again smite any more every living thing.' The sense of which plainly is, that, notwithstanding the wickedness of mankind, though they sin from their childhood, yet would he not, on that account, again destroy 'every living thing.' Here it is to be observed, 1. That the words were spoken as soon as Noah came forth from the ark, and, therefore, after the antediluvian race of actual and flagrant transgressors had perished, and before the family of Noah had begun to multiply upon the earth; when, in fact, there were no human beings upon earth but righteous Noah and his family. 2. That they are spoken of 'man' *as man*; that is, of human nature, and, consequently, of Noah himself and the persons saved with him in the ark. 3. That it is affirmed of MAN, that is, of mankind, that the imagination of the heart 'is evil from his youth.' Now the

term 'imagination' includes the thoughts, affections, and inclinations; and the word 'youth' the whole time from the birth, the earliest age of man. This passage, therefore, affirms the natural and hereditary tendency of man to evil.

"The book of Job, which embodies the patriarchal theology, gives ample testimony to this as the faith of those ancient times. Job xi. 12: 'Vain man would be wise, though man be born like a wild ass' colt;' fierce, untractable, and scarcely to be subjected. This is the case from his birth; it is affirmed of man, and is equally applicable to every age; it is his *natural* condition, he is '*born*,' literally, '*the colt of a wild ass*.'

"'Man is born unto trouble as the sparks fly upward,' Job v. 7; that is, he is inevitably subjected to trouble; this is the law of his state in this world, as fixed and certain as one of the laws of nature. The proof from this passage is inferential, but very decisive. Unless man is born a sinner, it is not to be accounted for, that he should be born to trouble. Pain and death are the consequences only of sin, and absolutely innocent beings must be exempt from them.

"'Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?' Job xiv. 4. The word thing is supplied by our translators, but *person* is evidently understood. Cleanness and uncleanness, in the language of Scripture, signify holiness and sin; and the text clearly asserts the natural impossibility of any man being born sinless, because he is produced by guilty and defiled parents.

"What is man, that he should be clean; and he which is born of a woman, that he should be righteous?' Job xv. 14. The same doctrine is here affirmed as in the preceding text, only more fully, and it may be taken as an explanation of the former, which was, perhaps, a proverbial expression. The rendering of the LXX is here worthy of notice, for, though it does not agree with the present Hebrew text, it strongly marks the sentiments of the ancient Jews on the point in question.

'Who shall be clean from filth? Not one; even though his life on earth *be a single day.*'

Ps. li. 5: 'Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me.' What possible sense can be given to this passage on the hypothesis of man's natural innocence? It is in vain to render the first clause 'I was *brought forth* in iniquity;' for nothing is gained by it. David charges nothing upon his mother, of whom he is not speaking, but of himself; he was conceived, or, if it please better, was born a sinner. And if the rendering of the latter clause were allowed, which yet has no authority, 'in sin did my mother *nurse* me;' still no progress is made in getting quit of its testimony to the moral corruption of children, for it is the child only which is nursed, and, if that be allowed, natural depravity is allowed, depravity before reasonable choice, which is the point in question.

"Ps. lviii. 3, 4: 'The wicked are estranged from the womb, they go astray as soon as they are born, speaking lies.' They are *alienated* from the womb, 'alienated from the life of God, from the time of their coming into the world.' 'Speaking lies:' they show a tendency to speak lies as soon as they are capable of it, which shows the existence of a natural principle of falsehood.

"Prov. xxii. 15, and xxix. 15: 'Foolishness is bound up in the heart of a child; but the rod of correction shall drive it far from him.' 'The rod and reproof give wisdom, but a child left to himself bringeth his mother to shame.' 'These passages put together are a plain testimony of the inbred corruption of young children. Foolishness in the former is not barely appetite or a want of the knowledge attainable by instruction, as some have said. Neither of these deserve that sharp correction recommended. But it is indisposedness to what is good, and a strong propensity to evil. This foolishness is bound up in the heart of a child; it is rooted in his inmost nature. It is, as it were, fastened to him by strong cords; so the original word signifies.

From this corruption of the heart in every child, it is that the rod of correction is necessary to give him wisdom; hence it is that a child left to himself, without correction, brings his mother to shame. If a child were born equally inclined to virtue and vice, why should the wise man speak of foolishness or wickedness as fastened so closely to his heart? And why should the rod and reproof be so necessary for him? These texts, therefore, are another clear proof of the corruption of human nature.'

"The quotation of Psalm xiv. 2, 3, by the Apostle Paul, in Romans iii. 10, &c., is also an important Scriptural proof of the universal moral corruption of mankind.' 'The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand, and seek God. They are all gone aside, they are altogether become filthy; there is none that doeth good, no, not one.' When the Psalmist affirms this of the children of men, it is fair to conclude that he is speaking of all men, and of human nature as originating actual depravity; and it is, indeed, obvious, from the context, that he is thus accounting for atheism and other evils, the prevalence of which he laments. But as the Apostle quotes this passage and the parallel one in the 53d Psalm as Scriptural proofs of the universal corruption of mankind, the sense of the Psalmist is fixed by his authority, and cannot be questioned. All, indeed, that the opponents of this interpretation can say, is, that, in the same psalm the Psalmist speaks also of righteous persons, 'God is in the generation of the *righteous*;' but that is nothing to the purpose, seeing that those who contend for the universal corruption of mankind allow also that a remedy has been provided for the evil; and that by its application some, in every age, have been made righteous, who were originally and naturally sinful. In fact, it could not be said, with respect to men's actual moral conduct in that, or, probably, in any age, that 'not one' was righteous;' but in every

age it may be said, that not one is so originally, or by nature; so that the passage is not to be explained on the assumption that the inspired writer is speaking only of the practice of mankind in his own times.

"Of the same kind are all those passages which speak of what is morally evil as the characteristic and distinguishing mark, not of any individual, not of any particular people, living in some one age or part of the world, but of man, of human nature, and especially those which make sinfulness the natural state of that part of the human race who have not undergone that moral renovation which is the fruit of a Divine operation in the heart, a work ascribed particularly to the Holy Spirit. Of these texts the number is very great, and it adds also to the strength of their evidence, that the subject is often mentioned incidentally, and by way of illustration and argument in support of something else, and must, therefore, be taken to be an acknowledged and settled opinion among the sacred writers, both of the Old and New Testament, and one which neither they nor those to whom they spoke or wrote questioned or disputed.

"'Cursed,' says the Prophet Jeremiah, 'is he that trusteth in MAN.' Why in man if he were not, by nature, unworthy of trust? On the scheme of man's natural innocence, it would surely have been more appropriate to say, Cursed be he that trusteth indiscriminately in men, some of whom may have become corrupt; but here human nature itself, *man*, in the abstract, is held up to suspicion and caution. 'The heart,' proceeds the same Prophet, 'is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked, who can know it?' which is the reason adduced for the caution preceding against trusting in man. It is precisely in the same way that our Lord designates human nature, when he affirms, that 'from within, out of the heart, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, murders, &c.; all these things come from within, and defile the man.' This represen-

tation would not be true on the scheme of natural innocence. All these things would come from without, not from within, as their original source. The heart must first be corrupted by outward circumstances, before it could be the corrupter.

"But to proceed with instances of the more incidental references to the fault and disease of man's very nature, with which the Scriptures abound. 'How much more abominable and filthy is *man*, who drinketh iniquity like water?' Job xv. 16. 'Madness is in the heart of the *sons of men* while they live,' Eccles. ix. 3. 'But they like *men* have transgressed the covenant,' Hos. vi. 7. 'If *ye, being evil,* know how to give good gifts unto your children,' Matt. vi. 11. 'Thou savourest not the things that be of God; but the things that be of MEN,' Matt. xvi. 23. 'Are ye not carnal, and walk as MEN?' 1 Cor. iii. 3. 'That he no longer should live the rest of his time in the lusts of MEN; but to the will of God,' 1 Pet. iv. 2. 'We are of God, and the whole *world* lieth in wickedness,' 1 John v. 19. 'Except a man *be born again,* he cannot see the kingdom of GOD,' John iii. 8. 'That ye put off the *old man,* and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the new man,' Eph. iv. 23—24.

"The above texts are to be considered as specimens of the manner in which the sacred writers speak of the subject rather than as approaching to an enumeration of the passages in which the same sentiments are found in great variety of expression, and which are adduced on various occasions. They are, however, sufficient to show that *man* and the *heart of man,* and the moral nature of man, are spoken of by them in a way not to be reconciled to the notion of their purity, or even their indifference to good and evil. On two parts of the New Testament, however, which irresistibly fix the whole of this evidence in favor of the opinion of the universal Church of Christ, in all ages, our remarks may be somewhat more extended. The first is our Lord's discourse

with Nicodemus, John iii., in which he declares the necessity of a new birth, in contradistinction to our natural birth, in order to our entrance into the kingdom of GOD; and lays it down, that the Spirit of God is the sole author of this change, and that what is born of the flesh cannot alter its nature; it is flesh still, and must always remain so, and in that state is unfit for heaven. 'Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God; that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.' Throughout the New Testament, it will be found, that when flesh and spirit are, in a moral sense, opposed to each other, the one means the corrupt nature and habits of men, not sanctified by the gospel; the other, either the principle and habit of holiness in good men, or the Holy Spirit himself, who imparts and constantly nurtures them. 'I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing,' Rom. vii. 18. 'I myself with the mind serve the law of God; but with the *flesh*, the law of sin,' Rom. vii. 25. 'There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the *flesh*, but after the Spirit,' Rom. viii. 1. 'They that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit. For to be *carnally minded* is death; but to be *spiritually minded* is life and peace. Because the *carnal mind* is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are *in the flesh* cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you,' Rom. viii. 5—9.

"These passages from St. Paul serve to fix the meaning of the terms flesh and spirit, as used by the Jews, and as they occur in the discourse of our Lord with Nicodemus; and they are so exactly parallel to it, that they fully confirm the opinion of those who understand our Lord as expressly asserting that man is by

nature corrupt and sinful, and unfit, in consequence, for the kingdom of heaven: and that all amendment of his case must result, not from himself, so totally is he gone from original righteousness, but from that special operation of the Holy Spirit which produces a new birth or regeneration. Both assert the natural state of man to be fleshly, that is, morally corrupt; both assert that in man himself there is no remedy; and both attribute principles of holiness to a supernatural agency, the agency of the Spirit of God himself.

"No criticism can make this language consistent with the theory of natural innocence. St. Paul describes the state of man, before he comes under the quickening and renewing influence of the Spirit, as being 'in the flesh;' in which state 'he *cannot* please God;' as having a 'carnal mind,' which 'is not, and *cannot* be, subject to the law of God.' Our Lord, in like manner, describes this state of 'the flesh,' this condition of entire unfitness for the kingdom of heaven as our *natural* state; and, to make this the stronger, he refers this unfitness for heaven, not to our acquired habits, but to the state in which we are born: for the very reason which he gives for the necessity of a new birth is, that 'that which is *born* of the flesh is flesh,' and, therefore, we 'must be *born again*.' To interpret, therefore, the phrase, 'to be flesh, as being born of the flesh,' merely to signify that we are, by natural birth, endowed with the physical powers of human nature, is utterly absurd; for what, then, is to be born of the Spirit? Is it to receive physical powers which do not belong to human nature? Or, if they go a step further, and admit, that 'to be flesh, or being born of the flesh,' means to be frail and mortal like our parents; still the interpretation is a physical and not a moral one, and leads to this absurdity, that we must interpret the being born of the Spirit physically, and not morally, likewise. Now, since the being born of the Spirit refers to a change which is effected in *time*, and not at the resurrection, because our

Lord speaks of being 'born of *water*' as well as the Spirit, by which he means baptism; and, as St. Paul says to the Romans, in the passage above quoted, 'ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit;' and, therefore, speaks of their present experience in this world, it may be asked, what *physical* change did in reality take place in them in consequence of being 'born of the Spirit?' On all hands it is allowed, that none took place; that they remained 'frail and mortal' still; and it follows, therefore, that it is a moral and not a physical change which is spoken of, both by our Lord and by the Apostle; and, if a moral change from sin to holiness, then is the natural state of man from his birth, and in consequence of his birth, sinful and corrupt.

"The other passage is the argument in the third chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, in which the Apostle 'proves both Jews and Gentiles under sin, that *every mouth* may be stopped, and *all the world* may become guilty before God;' and then proposes the means of salvation by faith in Christ, on the express ground that '*all* have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.' Whoever reads that argument, and considers the universality of the terms used, ALL, EVERY, ALL THE WORLD, BOTH JEWS AND GENTILES, must conclude, in all fairness of interpretation, that the whole human race, of every age, is intended. But, if any will construe his words partially, then he is placed in the following dilemma:—The Apostle grounds the wisdom and mercy of that provision which is made for man's salvation in the gospel upon man's sinfulness, danger, and helplessness. Now the gospel as a remedy for disease, as salvation from danger, is designed for all men, or but for a part; if for all, then all are diseased and in danger; if but for a part, then the undiseased part of the human race, those who are in no danger, have no interest in the gospel; it is not adapted to their case; and not only is the argument of the Apostle lost, but those who advocate this notion must explain how it is that our Lord

himself commanded the gospel to be preached 'to *every creature*,' if but a part of mankind needs its salvation. —*Watson.*

"The doctrine, then, of Scripture is, I think, clearly established to be, that of the natural and universal corruption of man's nature;" but before we dismiss this subject we shall endeavor to answer some of the objections urged against the doctrine of hereditary depravity.

I. It is said to be impossible for man to be born in sin, for sin is the abuse of one's powers.

"To this we answer:—The Scriptures uniformly assert, that man is 'shapen in iniquity,' and 'conceived in sin;' that 'man cannot be clean who is born of a woman;' and that 'that which is born of the flesh is flesh,' and needs to 'be born of the Spirit' before it can enter the kingdom of heaven. To contradict this statement is, therefore, to contradict the plainest assertions of Scripture.

"This objection makes no distinction between a wrong choice and a wrong disposition; between the wrong state and the wrong use of our powers. That man cannot be born with any thing which implies a wrong choice already made is obvious. Perhaps it will be granted that we have no innate ideas, and, therefore, as principles are compounded of ideas, that we have no innate moral principles. But may there not be a disorder of the faculties before those faculties are called into action? We easily grant the possibility of the birth of a human body disordered in any of its senses or members, or in all of them. A human body may be born blind, or deaf, or dumb, or maimed, or lame. Again: A man may be born with a false taste, which exists before either food or poison has been presented to him; and, therefore, before his taste has been vitiated by the use of poison. Now, where is the impossibility of the mental powers being produced in disorder? Why must they of necessity be in proper order and harmony? Why is it impossible that the under-

standing should be naturally blind, and the passions headstrong? What reason is to be assigned in proof that the taste (shall we call it) cannot be naturally false, and give a wrong bias to the subsequent choice?" —*Hare.*

2. It is objected that this doctrine of hereditary depravity makes God the author of sin; for it is said that the proper production of the child is from God; and if God produce a child which has sinful dispositions, he must produce those dispositions.

"This argument proves too much. It would prove God to be the author of all actual, as well as original (or hereditary) sin. For it is the power of God, under certain laws and established rules, which produces not only the *fœtus*, but all the motion in the universe. It is his power which so violently expands the air on the discharge of a pistol or cannon. It is the same which produces muscular motion, and the circulation of all the juices in man. But does he therefore produce adultery, or murder? Is he the cause of those sinful motions? He is the cause of the motion, (as he is of the *fœtus*,) of the sin he is not. Do not say this is too fine a distinction. Fine as it is, you must necessarily allow it. Otherwise you make God the direct author of all the sin under heaven. To apply this more directly to the point. God does produce the *fœtus* of man as he does of trees, empowering the one and the other to propagate each after its kind. And a sinful man propagates, after his kind, another sinful man. Yet God produces, in the sense above mentioned, the man, but not the sin."—*(Mr. J. Wesley on Original Sin.)*

3. This doctrine is said to apologise for the actual wretchedness of mankind; for if men are naturally disposed to sin, they cannot be justly blamed for sinning.

"That the natural depravity of the human soul is unavoidable, we grant; but not that the personal wickedness of every man is unavoidable. Nothing but universal depravity can account for universal wicked-

ness; and universal wickedness would be the necessary consequence of universal depravity, if there were no cure for it. But 'the grace of God, which bringeth salvation, hath appeared unto all men, teaching them that denying (renouncing) ungodliness and worldly lusts, they should live soberly, and righteously, and godly, in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works,' Titus ii. 11—13. Under these circumstances, mankind are placed in a state of personal probation: with this difference, however; Adam was created upright, and was proved whether he would fall; we are born prone, and, under a remediate law, are proved whether we will rise. He sinned voluntarily against the law of innocence; we sin voluntarily against the law of grace. He sinned and induced the disorder; we sin partly by neglecting the remedy, and partly in consequence of that neglect. Our disease is unavoidable; but not so our neglect of the cure."—*Hare.*

4. It is objected that this doctrine renders it impossible for those who die in infancy to be saved. But "there is nothing inconsistent between the ruin and depravity of infants by the sin of their parents, and their being finally saved by Jesus Christ. 'If by the offence of one, judgment came upon them to condemnation; so, by the righteousness of one, the free gift comes upon them unto justification of life.' However necessary it may be that they who, by personal sin, have confirmed the original sentence of condemnation, should seek and accept a personal interest in Christ, it cannot be necessary for those who have committed no personal sin, and who have never been capable of a personal application of the merit of the Saviour. As to their participation of human depravity, they have never, by an unholy choice or deed, given themselves up to its government;

and, therefore, dying in personal innocence, they may be renewed by an operation of the Holy Spirit, which does not require, as in the case of adults, their personal co-operation. Their ruin has been effected without their personal fault; and their recovery is effected without their personal choice.

"As the depravity and ruin of mankind are clearly and decisively demonstrated, in the sacred Scriptures, to be the natural and judicial consequences of the sin of their first parents, the whole Unitarian system must fall to the ground. The rational divines must relinquish their confidence in the infallibility of human reason; grant that a Divine Redeemer and Restorer is necessary; submit to the doctrine of a propitiatory sacrifice; and acknowledge their want of a supernatural influence on their minds and hearts, in order to their salvation. They must renounce their boasts of the moral dignity of human nature; rank themselves with publicans and sinners; and condescend to be saved by grace. Nor will they hereby lose any thing but their unreasonable prejudices and their destructive sins."—*Hare.*

CHAPTER VIII.

THE ATONEMENT MADE BY CHRIST.

Having shown in the last chapter that man is a sinner by nature as well as by practice, or, in other words, that he is a guilty rebel in the sight of a holy God, we shall now endeavor to establish the doctrine of a vicarious atonement, or, that Jesus Christ has suffered in our stead, being made a curse for us, that we might escape the curse of the violated yet inflexible law of God. This is a doctrine which is denied by all classes of Unitarians, as may be seen by turning to the quotation made from Mr. Yates, on page 16, where, after enumerating

ness; and universal wickedness would be the necessary consequence of universal depravity, if there were no cure for it. But 'the grace of God, which bringeth salvation, hath appeared unto all men, teaching them that denying (renouncing) ungodliness and worldly lusts, they should live soberly, and righteously, and godly, in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works,' Titus ii. 11—13. Under these circumstances, mankind are placed in a state of personal probation: with this difference, however; Adam was created upright, and was proved whether he would fall; we are born prone, and, under a remediate law, are proved whether we will rise. He sinned voluntarily against the law of innocence; we sin voluntarily against the law of grace. He sinned and induced the disorder; we sin partly by neglecting the remedy, and partly in consequence of that neglect. Our disease is unavoidable; but not so our neglect of the cure."—*Hare.*

4. It is objected that this doctrine renders it impossible for those who die in infancy to be saved. But "there is nothing inconsistent between the ruin and depravity of infants by the sin of their parents, and their being finally saved by Jesus Christ. 'If by the offence of one, judgment came upon them to condemnation; so, by the righteousness of one, the free gift comes upon them unto justification of life.' However necessary it may be that they who, by personal sin, have confirmed the original sentence of condemnation, should seek and accept a personal interest in Christ, it cannot be necessary for those who have committed no personal sin, and who have never been capable of a personal application of the merit of the Saviour. As to their participation of human depravity, they have never, by an unholy choice or deed, given themselves up to its government;

and, therefore, dying in personal innocence, they may be renewed by an operation of the Holy Spirit, which does not require, as in the case of adults, their personal co-operation. Their ruin has been effected without their personal fault; and their recovery is effected without their personal choice.

"As the depravity and ruin of mankind are clearly and decisively demonstrated, in the sacred Scriptures, to be the natural and judicial consequences of the sin of their first parents, the whole Unitarian system must fall to the ground. The rational divines must relinquish their confidence in the infallibility of human reason; grant that a Divine Redeemer and Restorer is necessary; submit to the doctrine of a propitiatory sacrifice; and acknowledge their want of a supernatural influence on their minds and hearts, in order to their salvation. They must renounce their boasts of the moral dignity of human nature; rank themselves with publicans and sinners; and condescend to be saved by grace. Nor will they hereby lose any thing but their unreasonable prejudices and their destructive sins."—*Hare.*

CHAPTER VIII.

THE ATONEMENT MADE BY CHRIST.

Having shown in the last chapter that man is a sinner by nature as well as by practice, or, in other words, that he is a guilty rebel in the sight of a holy God, we shall now endeavor to establish the doctrine of a vicarious atonement, or, that Jesus Christ has suffered in our stead, being made a curse for us, that we might escape the curse of the violated yet inflexible law of God. This is a doctrine which is denied by all classes of Unitarians, as may be seen by turning to the quotation made from Mr. Yates, on page 16, where, after enumerating

the points on which Unitarians differ, he definitely states that all Unitarians agree "in rejecting the doctrine of satisfaction and vicarious atonement." Mr. Grundy says: "This doctrine converts justice into vengeance. It first plunges its sword into the soul of the innocent; it afterward pursues multitudes of those whose punishment he bore, and relentlessly plunges them into the flames of hell, because they cannot satisfy its demands, which were all satisfied by his suffering in their stead." The same sentiment is held, and the same language used, in substance, by those Unitarians who call themselves Christians, some of whom have exclaimed, "What! wash in the blood of Christ? It would render your garment filthy. It was rotten eighteen hundred years ago!" And one of their preachers (the Rev. Mr. Sanford,) told the writer, in reference to this work, that he need have no fears in setting it down as the faith of their Church, that they denied the doctrine of Vicarious Atonement. This doctrine, then, being generally denied by our opponents, we shall now endeavor to establish its truth, which we might forcibly argue from the necessity of there being such a provision made for the redemption of man, without which salvation could never have been offered to a lost and ruined world; but having extended our remarks on other subjects, beyond our intended limits, we must necessarily be more brief upon this important subject than we otherwise should be. We shall, therefore, appeal directly to the express testimony of scripture, at the same time requesting the reader, who would see a more extensive investigation of the subject, to refer to an excellent work recently published by the Rev. Luther Lee, entitled "Universalism Examined," in which this subject is more largely discussed, and from which some of the following arguments are extracted. But to proceed—

1. We argue this doctrine from the fact that the "scriptures teach, directly, that the sufferings and death

of Jesus Christ, were in the place of the punishment which was due to sinners; he suffering in their stead, bearing the punishment which they otherwise must have borne, and from which they, consequently, may now be delivered on gospel terms. By this, however, we do not mean that Christ suffered the same in kind and degree that sinners would have suffered, but simply that what he suffered was a substitute for what they must have suffered without the atonement. Isa. liii. 5, 6, 8, 11, 12. 'He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed. The Lord hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all; for the transgression of my people was he stricken. He shall bear their iniquities, and he bore the sin of many and made intercession for the transgressors.'

"That this whole chapter relates to Jesus Christ there is no doubt, and if it does not teach that he suffered for sinners, bearing a punishment for their sins, it is because the sentiment cannot be couched in the English language. Why was he wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our iniquities, if it was not to save us from being thus wounded and bruised? It is worthy of remark, that in this interesting chapter, Christ is represented as suffering for us by divine appointment, and under the divine sanction: 'the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all'—'when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin.' Now, if it was not the divine purpose to save us from the punishment our sins deserve by laying our iniquities on Jesus Christ, and making his soul an offering for sin; if after all this, we must inevitably suffer *all* that our sins deserve, then what Christ suffered for us must have been over and above what justice requires, and, consequently, unjust and cruel."—*Lee.*

In addition to this, we would remark, that if the chastisement of our peace was upon the Saviour, he must have suffered in our stead for, as Mr. Watson

very justly remarks, "chastisement is the punishment of a fault; but the suffering person, of whom the Prophet speaks, is declared by him to be wholly free from transgression; to be perfectly and emphatically innocent. This prophecy is applied to Christ by the Apostles, whose constant doctrine is the entire immaculateness of their Master and Lord. If chastisement, therefore, was laid upon Christ, it could not be on account of faults of his own; his sufferings were the chastisement of our faults, the price of our peace, and his 'stripes' were borne by him for our 'healing.' Again, our iniquities, that is, according to the Hebrew mode of speaking, their punishment, are made to meet upon him; they are fixed together and laid upon him; the penalty is *exacted* from him, though he himself had incurred no penalty personally, and, therefore, it was in consequence of that vicarious exaction that he was 'afflicted,' was 'made answerable,' and, voluntarily submitting, 'he opened not his mouth.'"—"These passages, therefore, prove a *substitution, a suffering in our stead.* The chastisement of offences was laid upon him, in order to our peace; and the offences were ours, since they could not be his 'who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth.'"—*Watson.*

"But we recollect of having seen an attempt made by" Unitarians "to evade the force of the above quotations from the Prophet. It has been said that this prophecy was fulfilled in the miracles which Christ wrought for the relief of the afflicted; in proof of which they quote Matt. viii. 16, 17: 'He healed all that were sick, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet saying, himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses.' That this is a quotation from the same chapter, we admit, but it is not a quotation from any portion which we have quoted, or on which we rely as proof of the point in question, but is borrowed from the fourth verse, which reads thus: 'Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows.' These are the

words which the Evangelist applies to Christ's healing the sick, which can furnish no ground for making the same application of the whole chapter, some of which most clearly refers to his death and not to the works of benevolence which he performed during his ministry. There is a vast difference between his bearing our grief and carrying our sorrows, or as the Evangelist renders it, 'taking our infirmities and bearing our sicknesses, and being wounded for our transgressions,' and 'bruised for our iniquities;' or being 'numbered with the transgressors,' and bearing 'the sin of many.' But this question is settled by the fact that two other Evangelists quote from the same subject and apply it to his crucifixion. Mark xv. 27, 28: 'And with him they crucify two thieves; the one on his right hand, and the other on his left; and the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, and he was numbered with the transgressors.' This is a quotation from the 12th, which reads thus: 'He hath poured out his soul unto death, and he was numbered with the transgressors, and he bare the sin of many.' Luke xxxii. 37: 'And he was reckoned among the transgressors.' It is clear, then, that the Prophet describes the death, as well as the life of our blessed Lord, and forcibly points it out as a sacrifice for sin.

"In the above position we are, if possible, more amply sustained by the Apostles in the New Testament, who express the same sentiment, in nearly the same language, evidently borrowing their descriptions from the above paintings of the prophetic pencil.

"1 Cor. xv. 3: 'For I delivered unto you first of all, that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures.' Several points in this text deserve notice.

1. "The substance of the Apostle's declaration is, 'Christ died for our sins.'

2. "This doctrine of the vicarious death of Christ, he declares he received: 'I delivered unto you that which I also received.' It was not a thought of his

own, nor the invention of man, but he received it from God, who called him to preach Christ crucified.

3. "This doctrine of Christ's death for our sins, he says, he 'delivered unto them first of all,' showing that he considered the doctrine of Christ's vicarious death one of the first principles of the gospel, of the first importance, on which the sinner's hope rests, and upon which the whole gospel fabric is reared.

4. "This doctrine of Christ's death for our sins, he declares, is 'according to the Scriptures.'

"Let it be understood that by the Scriptures here, the Old Testament only can be intended, and what we have said on this subject, reasoning from the law and the Prophets, is confirmed. As the Apostle declares that Christ's death for our sins was according to the Scriptures of the Old Testament, it follows that the sin offerings made under the law were representations of his death, and pointed him out as suffering for sinners; and that the Prophet, in foretelling his passion, referred to the same object of his death, saying, 'When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin he shall see his seed,' &c.

1 Pet. ii. 24, 25: 'Who his ownself bare our sins, in his own body on the tree, by whose stripes ye are healed; for ye were as sheep going astray.' This is almost a literal quotation from the Prophet, whose words we have already considered, and goes farther to show that we are sustained by the New Testament writers, in our application of the Prophet's language to the death of Christ, as a sacrifice for sin. The Apostle here is so plain and precise that it seems hardly possible to misunderstand or misapply his language.

1. "He states that Christ bore our sins.

2. "To show, beyond all dispute, that he bore them literally, and not in some symbolical or allegorical manner, he notes the manner in which he bore them, in three particulars: First, he bore them 'his own self.'

Secondly, he bore them 'in his own body.' Thirdly, he bore them 'on the tree,' i. e., on the cross.

3. "Lest some skeptic should still question the meritorious character of Christ's sufferings the Apostle adds 'by his stripes ye are healed.'

"Rom. iv. 25: 'Who was delivered for our offences and raised again for our justification.' Here the Apostle clearly asserts Christ's death for sinners, and their deliverance or salvation from the guilt of sin by his resurrection; i. e., he died to atone for our sins, and rose again to intercede for us, by pleading the merits of his death; we, therefore, may be justified, i. e., saved from the guilt and consequently the punishment of sin, through his resurrection.

"2 Cor. v. 21: 'For he hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.' On this text it may be remarked,

1. "By Christ's being made sin for us, we are to understand that he was made a sin offering for us, or an offering for our sin.

2. "The design of this was that we might be made the righteousness of God in him, by which we understand, being made the partakers of God's justifying and renewing grace, whereby we are rendered righteous. This is termed the righteousness of God, because the pardon of sin on the ground of the sin offering of Christ, whereby we are justified from sins that are past, is the prerogative and act of God, and because the internal work of renewing the heart and sanctifying the soul, whereby we are rendered righteous in heart and life, is the work of God's Holy Spirit."—*Lee.*

"The Socinian Improved Version has a note on this passage so obscure that the point is evidently given up in despair. Socinus before had attempted an elusive interpretation, which requires scarcely an effort to refute. By Christ's being made 'sin,' he would understand being esteemed a sinner by men. But, as Grotius ob-

serves, neither is the Greek word, translated sin, nor the Hebrew word answering to it, ever taken in such a sense. Besides, the Apostle has attributed this act to God; it was he who made him to be sin; but he certainly did not cause the Jews and others to esteem Christ a wicked man. On the contrary, by a voice from heaven, and by miracles, he did all that was proper to prove to all men his innocence. Farther, St. Paul places 'sin' and 'righteousness' in opposition to each other—'we are made the righteousness of GOD,' that is, are justified and freed from Divine punishment; but in order to this, Christ was 'made sin,' or bore our punishment. There is also another antithesis in the Apostle's words—God made him who knew no sin, and consequently deserved no punishment, to be sin; that is, it pleased him that he should be punished; but Christ was innocent, not only according to human laws, but according to the law of God; the antithesis, therefore, requires us to understand that he bore the penalty of the law, and that he bore it in our stead."—*Watson.*

"1 Pet. iii. 18: 'For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh but quickened by the Spirit.'

1. "This text declares that Christ suffered for sins.

2. "It was was not his own sins for which he suffered, for he was without sin, but he suffered 'the just for the unjust,' his sufferings were, therefore, vicarious.

3. "The object of his sufferings was that he might bring us to God; his sufferings, therefore, must have been necessary in order to our salvation.

4. "To show that the salvation of sinners depends upon the merits of Christ's death, and not upon the influence of his example and truth, revealed in his gospel aside from his death, the Apostle refers the whole to his passion: 'He suffered for sin, that he might bring us to God, *being put to death in the flesh.*'

"Heb. ix. 28: 'So Christ was once offered to bear

the sins of many.' Chapter ii. 9: 'But we see Jesus, &c., 'that he by the grace of God should *taste death for every man.*' This class of texts might be multiplied to almost any extent, but it is unnecessary to add, enough has been produced to show, beyond dispute, that Christ did suffer for sinners, and that he suffered and died by Divine appointment on the part of the Father, and as a free-will offering on his own part. The death of Christ, then, must have been an atonement for sinners, essential to their salvation, or it would never have been voluntarily endured by himself or sanctioned by the Father."—*Lee.*

II. "The death of Christ is expressly represented in the New Testament as *penal,* which it could not be in any other way than by his taking our place, and suffering in our stead. This is manifest from Gallatians iii. 13: 'Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse [an execration] for us, for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.' The passage in Moses, to which Paul refers, is Deut. xxi. 22, 23: 'If a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and be put to death, and they hang him on a tree, his body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt in any wise bury him that day, *for he that is hanged is accursed of God,* that thy land be not defiled.' This infamy was only inflicted upon great offenders, and was designed to show the light in which the person thus exposed was viewed by God—he was a curse or execration. On this the remarks of Grotius are most forcible and conclusive.—'Socinus says, that to be an execration means to be under the punishment of execration, which is true. For cursed every where denotes punishment proceeding from the sanction of law: 2 Pet. ii. 14; Mark xxv. 41. Socinus also admits that the cross of Christ was this curse; his cross, therefore, had the nature of punishment, which is what we maintain. Perhaps Socinus allows that the cross of Christ was a punishment, because Pilate, as a judge,

inflicted it; but this does not come up to the intention of the Apostle; for, in order to prove that Christ was made obnoxious to punishment, he cites Moses, who expressly asserts, that whoever hangs on a tree, according to the Divine law, is accursed of God,—consequently, in the words of the Apostle, who cites this place of Moses, and refers it to Christ, we must supply the same circumstance, accursed of God, as if it had said Christ was made accursed of God, or obnoxious to the highest and most ignominious punishment for us, that the blessing of Abraham might come upon the Gentiles, &c. For when the Apostles speak of the sufferings of Christ in reference to our good, they do not regard the acts of men in them, but the act of God.'"

III. This doctrine may also be argued from those passages of Holy Scripture which represent the death of Christ as a propitiation for our sins. For, "to propitiate is to appease, to atone, to turn away the wrath of an offended person. In the case before us, the wrath turned away is the wrath of God; the person making the propitiation is Christ; the propitiating offering or sacrifice is his blood. All this is expressed in most explicit terms in the following passages: 1 John ii. 2: 'And he is the *propitiation* for our sins.' 1 John iv. 10: 'Herein is love, not that we loved God; but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the *propitiation* for our sins.' Rom. iii. 25: 'Whom God hath set forth to be a *propitiation* through faith *in his blood.*"

Unitarians have no way of evading the force of these passages, but by denying the existence of wrath in God. This they do in hopes "of proving that propitiation, in a proper sense, cannot be the doctrine of Scripture, whatever may be the force of the terms which the sacred writers employ. In order to give plausibility to their statement, they pervert and caricature the opinion of the orthodox, and argue as though it formed a part of the doctrine of Christ's propitiation and oblation for sin, that God is naturally an implacable and vengeful

being, only made placable and disposed to show mercy by satisfaction being made to his displeasure through our Lord's sufferings and death. This is as contrary to Scripture as it is to the opinions of all sober persons who hold the doctrine of Christ's atonement. God is Love; but it is not necessary, in order to support this truth, to assume that he is nothing else. He has, as we have seen other attributes, which harmonize with this and with each other, though, assuredly, that harmony cannot be exhibited by any who deny the propitiation for sin made by the death of Christ. Their system, therefore, obliges them to deny the existence of some of the attributes of God, or to explain them away.

"It is sufficient to show that there is not only no implacability in God, but a most tender and placable affection toward the sinning human race itself, that the Son of God, by whom the propitiation was made, was the free gift of the Father to us. This is the most eminent proof of his love, that for our sakes, and that mercy might be extended to us, 'he spared not his own Son; but delivered him up freely for us all.' Thus he is the *fountain* and first moving cause of that scheme of recovery and salvation which the incarnation and death of our Lord brought into full and efficient operation. The question, indeed, is not whether God is love, or whether he is of a placable nature; in that we are agreed; but it is, whether GOD is holy and just; whether we, his creatures, are under law or not; whether this law has any penalty, and whether GOD, in his rectoral character, is bound to execute and uphold that law." "These are points which no one can deny; and as the justice of God is punitive, (for if it is not punitive, his laws are a dead letter,) then is there *wrath* in God; then is God *angry* with the wicked; then is man, as a sinner, obnoxious to this *anger;* and so a propitiation becomes necessary to turn it away from him. Nor are these terms unscriptural; they are used in the

New Testament as emphatically as in the old, though in a special sense, a revelation of the mercy of God to man. John the Baptist declares, that, if any man believeth not on the Son of God, 'the *wrath of God* abideth upon him.' St. Paul declares, that 'the *wrath of God* is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men.' The day of judgment is, with reference to the ungodly, said to be 'the day of *wrath*;' God is called 'a *consuming fire*;' and as such, is the object of 'reverence and godly fear.' Nor is this his displeasure light; and the consequences of it a trifling and temporary inconvenience. When we only regard the consequences which have followed sin in society, from the earliest ages, and in every part of the world, and add to these the many direct and fearful inflictions of punishment which have proceeded from the 'Judge of the whole earth,' to use the language of Scripture, 'our flesh may well tremble because of his judgments.' But when we look at the future state of the wicked, as it is represented in Scripture, though expressed generally, and surrounded as it is with the mystery of a world, and a condition of being, unknown to us in the present state, all evils which history has crowded into the lot of man, appear insignificant in comparison to banishment from God—separation from the good—public condemnation—torment of spirit—'weeping, wailing, and gnashing of teeth'—'everlasting destruction'—'everlasting fire.' Let men talk ever so much, and eloquently, of the pure benevolence of God, they cannot abolish the facts recorded in the history of human suffering in this world as the effect of transgression; nor can they discharge these fearful comminations from the pages of the Book of God. They cannot be criticised away; and if it is 'Jesus who saved us from this wrath to come,' that is, from those effects of the wrath of God which are to come, then, but for him, we should have been liable to them. That principle in God, from which such effects follow, the Scriptures call

wrath; and they who deny the existence of wrath in God, deny, therefore, the Scriptures.

"It by no means follows, however, that those who thus bow to inspired authority, must interpret wrath to be a *passion* in God; or that, though we conclude the awful attribute of his justice to require satisfaction, in order to the forgiveness of the guilty, we afford reason to any to charge us with attributing vengeful affections to the Divine Being. 'Our adversaries,' says Bishop Stillingfleet, 'first make opinions for us, and then show that they are unreasonable. They first suppose that anger in God is to be considered as a passion, and that passion a desire of revenge, and then tell us, that if we do not prove that this desire of revenge can be satisfied by the sufferings of Christ, then we can never prove the doctrine of satisfaction to be true; whereas we do not mean, by God's anger, any such passion, but the just declaration of God's will to punish, upon our provocation of him by our sins; we do not make the design of the satisfaction to be that God may please himself in the revenging the sins of the guilty upon the most innocent person, because we make the design of punishment not to be the satisfaction of anger as a desire of revenge, but to be the vindication of the honor and rights of the offended person by such a way as he himself shall judge satisfactory to the ends of his government.

IV. "We now proceed with those passages of Scripture, the phraseology of which still farther establishes the doctrine of Christ's vicarious atonement. To those, in which Christ is called a propitiation, we add those which speak of *reconciliation* and the establishment of *peace* between God and man as the design and direct effect of his death. So Col. i. 19, 22, 'For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell, and having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to *reconcile* all things unto himself; by him I say,

whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven; and you that were some time alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he *reconciled*, in the body of his flesh through *death*.' Romans v. 10, 11, 'For if when we were enemies, we were *reconciled* to God, by the death of his Son, much more, being *reconciled*, we shall be saved by his life. And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received *atonement*.' 2 Cor. v. 18, 19, 'And all things are of God who hath *reconciled* us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation.'

"The expressions 'reconciliation' and 'making peace' necessarily suppose a previous state of hostility between God and man, which is reciprocal. This is sometimes called enmity, a term, as it respects God, rather unfortunate, since enmity is almost fixed in our language to signify a malignant and revengeful feeling. Of this, the oppugners of the doctrine of the atonement have availed themselves to argue, that as there can be no such affection in the Divine nature, therefore, reconciliation in Scripture does not mean the reconciliation of God to man, but of man to God, whose enmity the example and teaching of Christ they tell us are very effectual to subdue. It is, indeed, a sad and humbling truth, and one which Unitarians, in their discussions on the natural innocence of man, are not willing to admit, that by the infection of sin 'the carnal mind is enmity to GOD,' that human nature is malignantly hostile to God, and to the control of his law; but this is far from expressing the whole of that relation of man, in which, in Scripture he is said to be at enmity with GOD, and so to need a reconciliation—the making of peace between God and him. That relation is a legal one, as that of a sovereign in his judicial capacity, and a criminal who has violated his laws, and risen up against his authority, and who is, therefore, an enemy.

"But that there is no truth in the notion that reconciliation means no more than our laying aside our enmity to God, may be shown from Romans, v. 10, 'For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God.' Here the act of reconciling is ascribed to God and not to us; but if this reconciliation consisted in the laying aside our own enmity, the act would be ours alone; and, farther, that it could not be the laying aside of our enmity, is clear from the text, which speaks of reconciliation while we were yet enemies.

"Here also a critical remark will be appropriate. The above passage will show how falsely it has been asserted that God is no where, in Scripture, said to be reconciled to us, and that they only declare that we are reconciled to GOD; but the fact is, that the very phrase *of our being reconciled to God*, imports the turning away his wrath from us. When the Philistines suspected that David would appease the anger of Saul, by becoming their adversary, they said, 'wherewith should he *reconcile* himself to his master? Should it not be with the heads of these men?'—not, surely, how shall he remove his own anger against his master; but how shall he remove his master's anger against him; how shall he restore himself to his master's favor? 'If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught *against thee*,' not that *thou* hast aught against thy *brother*, 'first be *reconciled* to thy brother;' that is, appease and conciliate him: so that the words, in fact, import '*see that thy brother be reconciled to thee*,' since that which goes before is not that he hath done thee an injury, but thou him."—*Watson.*

"Again, the Apostle says, 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6, 'There is one God and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, *who gave himself a ransom for all.*' Christ then, as mediator, gave himself a ransom (*antilutron*, the price of redemption) for all. To whom was this ransom paid? It was not paid to man, to purchase his favor and reconciliation to God, by the pay-

ment of a price! The Apostle informs us to whom Christ gave himself a ransom, Heb. ix. 14. 'Who' (Christ) 'through the eternal spirit, offered himself without spot to God.' Christ, then, as mediator, offered himself *to* God *for* man. The offering was made to God to render him propitious, and to procure, consistently with the principles of divine government, that grace by which sinners are renewed, pardoned, and reconciled to God. Heb. vii. 25. 'Wherefore he is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.' Does Christ intercede with men, in the sense of this text, to reconcile them to God? Or does he intercede *with* God *for* man, to render him propitious, that they may receive reconciling grace? Let God, by the mouth of his Apostle, answer this question. Heb. ix. 24. 'Christ is not entered into the holy place made with hands, which are the figures of the true, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us.' It is clear, then, that Christ intercedes with God for us. Eph. v. 2. 'Christ hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour.' This not only fully refutes the notion held by" Unitarians, "that men only, and not God, are reconciled by Christ, but it establishes, beyond doubt, the fact that an atonement *for the sins of men* has been made *to God*, the object of which is to render him propitious to his offending offspring, by enabling him to 'be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.' If, as" Unitarians "contend, God never was unreconciled to man but was always propitious, without reference to a vicarious atonement, man only being an unreconciled party, the offering and intercession of Christ should have been made *to* and *with man;* for it would not be necessary for Christ to offer himself to God, and intercede with him in behalf of man if God was not unreconciled, man only being the subject of reconciliation through the mediation of Christ.

But in opposition to this absurd notion, the Scriptures uniformly represent Christ as offering himself *to* God *for* man, and as interceding with him in behalf of his rebellious offspring."—*Lee.*

Another objection made by our opponents to the doctrine of reconciliation or atonement, is, that it represents God as changing from that state of reconciliation in which he stood to man when he first brought him into being to a state of unreconciliation, from which, in consequence of the atonement made by Christ, this doctrine, is said to represent him as changing back again to a state of reconciliation; and if all this be true, then God is no longer an immutable being.

In answer to this we would say, that if God now stands in the same relation to man that he did when man was first created, and shone in the divine image, then God must approve of all the conduct of man, consequently of all that black catalogue of crime and iniquity which has marked the history of the human family, since the fall of the first pair down to the present time, therefore, as far as man is concerned, must stand opposed to punishment of every kind. For it would be absurd to suppose that the Divine Being would punish men when he was perfectly reconciled to them, especially for deeds of which he approved; therefore, all the judgments which he has poured upon nations and individuals, in consequence of their sins, are only so many instances of injustice and cruelty in the Deity.

2. If God, independent of the atonement, now stands in the same reconciled relation as that in which he stood before the fall, then, as above remarked, he certainly cannot punish him; consequently, the sufferings and death of Christ are not only unnecessary, but God must have been unjust and cruel in requiring his son thus to suffer and die while man was exposed to no danger, but perfectly safe and sure of heaven without his sufferings, death, mediation, or intercession.

But the various judgments which God has poured upon those nations who have incurred his displeasure is sufficient to answer the above objection. The destruction of the old world by water, and the cities of the plains by fire—the awful calamities with which he visited the Jewish people when they forsook his worship—the curse under which the earth now groans—the judgment poured upon thousands of blasphemers, Sabbath breakers, and other heaven daring sinners in this life, as well as the wailings of the lost in the dungeons of eternal night, all tell, in the most emphatic language, that God is not reconciled to sinners while out of Christ, and if God must change in order to be reconciled, then man may give up all hope of ever gaining the favor of God, and retire in hopeless despair to the dismal shades of endless night, for God can never change.

But it is not true that God cannot now be unreconciled to man, although he was once reconciled. To show this, we will take an illustration. Suppose the government of the United States sends a man of war to cruise against pirates—I ask, is not the government reconciled to her crew when she sends them out? All must answer yes, or she would not have sent them. Suppose, still farther, that after some months this crew turn pirates, and themselves plunder every vessel which they meet, not sparing the property and lives of our own citizens. I now ask, is the government reconciled to these men now that they have deserted her service, plundered her property, and murdered her citizens? All will answer no, and justify the government in pursuing and destroying these guilty murderers. But has the government changed? No. She is still the same government, pursuing the same onward course; but she stands in a new relation to these supposed individuals, in other words, she was once reconciled but is now unreconciled, while, at the same time, she has not changed, but remains the same. But if an earthly government

can be reconciled and then become unreconciled without changing, why may not God, although once reconciled, now become unreconciled, or stand in a different relation to man from that in which he stood when man first awoke to conscious being, without being charged with mutability or change.

Another objection made by Unitarians "to this doctrine of reconciliation may be easily answered. When we speak of the necessity of Christ's atonement, in order to man's forgiveness, we are told, that we represent the Deity as implacable; when we rebut that by showing that it was his very placability, his boundless and ineffable love to men, which sent his Son into the world to die for the sins of mankind, they rejoin, with their leaders, Socinus and Crellius, that then 'God was reconciled before he sent his Son, and that, therefore, Christ did not die to reconcile GOD to us.' The answer plainly is, that in this objection, they either mean that God had, from the placability and compassion of his nature, determined to be reconciled to offenders *upon* the sending his Son, or that he was actually reconciled when our Lord was sent. The first is what we contend for, and is in no wise inconsistent with the submission of our Lord to death, since that was in pursuance of the merciful appointment and decree of the Father; and the necessary medium by which this placability of God could honorably and consistently show itself in actual reconciliation, or the pardon of sin. That God was not actually reconciled to man, that is, that he did not forgive our offences, independent of the death of Christ, is clear, for then sin would have been forgiven before it was committed, and remission of sins could not have been preached in the name of Christ, nor could a ministry of reconciliation have been committed to the Apostles. The reconciliation of God to man is, throughout, a conditional one, and, as in all conditional processes of this kind, it has three stages. The first is when the party offended is disposed to ad-

mit of terms of agreement, which, in God, is matter of pure grace and favor; the second is when he declares his acceptance of the mediation of a third person, and that he is so satisfied with what he hath done in order to it, that he appoints it to be announced to the offender, that if the breach continues, the fault lies wholly upon himself; the third is when the offender accepts of the terms of agreement which are offered to him, submits, and is received into favor. 'Thus,' says Bishop Stillingfleet, 'upon the death and sufferings of Christ, God declares that he is so satisfied with what Christ hath done and suffered in order to the reconciliation between himself and us, that he now publishes remission of sins to the world, upon those terms which the Mediator hath declared by his own doctrine and the Apostles he sent to preach it. But because remission of sins doth not immediately follow upon the death of Christ, without any supposition of any act on our part, therefore the state of favor doth commence from the performance of the conditions which are required of us.' Whoever considers these obvious distinctions will have an ample answer to the above objection."—*Watson.*

V. "The doctrine of a vicarious atonement is fully confirmed by those scriptures which speak of Jesus Christ as a redeemer, and man as being redeemed by him.

"Matt. xx. 28 and Mark x. 45. 'The son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.'

"1 Tim. ii. 6. 'Who gave himself a ransom for all.' The English word *ransom* contained in the above quotations is thus defined by Dr. Webster.

"'RANSOM, *n.* 1. The money or price paid for the redemption of a prisoner or slave, or for goods captured by an enemy. 2. Release from captivity, bondage, or the possession of an enemy. 3. In *law*, a sum paid for the pardon of some great offence and the

discharge of the offender; or a fine paid in lieu of corporeal punishment. 4. In *scripture*, the price paid for a forfeited life, or for delivering or release from capital punishment. 5. The price paid for procuring the pardon of sins and the redemption of the sinner from punishment.'

"RANSOM, *v. t.* 1. To redeem from captivity or punishment by paying an equivalent. 2. To redeem from the possession of an enemy by paying a price deemed equivalent. 3. In *scripture*, to redeem from the bondage of sin, and from the punishment to which sinners are subjected by the divine law. 4. To rescue, to deliver.

"If then Christ 'gave himself a ransom for many,' 'for all,' in the above sense, there is no room for farther controversy. The texts above quoted teach that Christ has ransomed sinners from the bondage of sin and the punishment to which they are subjected by the divine law, by paying his life a price for theirs.

"It may then be asked, if the word *ransom* is a proper translation of the original Greek.

"The word which the Evangelist employs, rendered *ransom* by our translators, is *lutron*, which is thus defined in the Greek and English Lexicons: Lutron, *ransom, redemption, atonement, price of deliverance.* The word which the apostle uses in the above text is *antilutron*, and is thus defined: 'Antilutron, (from *anti*, inturn, and *lutron*, a ransom,) the price of redemption, ransom.'

"It is clear then that Christ has ransomed us by giving his life a ransom for ours.

"This view is farther supported by those scriptures, which express the same sentiment by the terms redeem, redemption, &c.

"Rom. iii. 24. 'Being justified freely by his grace, through the *redemption* that is in Christ Jesus.' 1. Cor. i. 30. 'But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who, of God, is made unto us *redemption.*' Gal. iv. 45. 'God

sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to *redeem* them that were under the law.' Tit. ii. 14. 'Who gave himself for us, that he might *redeem* us from all iniquity.' Heb. ix. 15. 'And for this cause he is the Mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the *redemption* of the transgressors that were under the first testament, that they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.'

It is clear, from these texts, that Christ has redeemed us, that he is the Redeemer and we the redeemed. We ask, then, what is it to redeem, or what is redemption? So far as the English word is concerned there can be hardly room for dispute.

"The word redeem Dr. Webster defines as follows:

"'REDEEM, *v. t.* 1. To purchase back; to ransom; to liberate or rescue from captivity or bondage, or from any obligation, or liability to suffer or to be forfeited, by paying an equivalent. 2. To repurchase what has been sold; to regain possession of a thing alienated, by repaying the value of it,' &c. With this corresponds his definition of the word redemption, which he defines thus: 'REDEMPTION, *n.*, repurchase of captured goods or persons; the act of procuring the deliverance of persons or things from the possession of captors by the payment of an equivalent. *** In theology, the ransom or deliverance of sinners from the bondage of sin and the penalties of God's violated law by the atonement of Christ.' Indeed, these terms are so well understood that it can hardly be necessary to produce authority to establish their meaning; and yet, if Christ has redeemed us in this sense, the controversy is ended in plain English, and the doctrine of vicarious atonement is established. Now that it is in this sense that Christ has redeemed us, appears from the following considerations:

1. "These English terms well express the sense of the original Greek.

"In Romans iii. 24, in the expression, 'through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus,' the Apostle uses the word *apolutroseos*, which our translators have rendered *redemption*, and which literally signifies deliverance from captivity.

"In Tit. ii. 14, in which it is said, Christ 'gave himself for us that he might redeem us,' the verb which is rendered *redeem* is, in the original, *lutrosetia*, which is derived from *lou*, to pay, and signifies to ransom or to redeem, and the very derivation of the word shows that it signifies to redeem by paying a redemption price.

"In Gal. iv. 4, 5, where the Apostle says, Christ 'was made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law,' the original word which is rendered *redeem* is *exagorase*. This word is compounded of *ex*, *from*, and *agorazo*, *to buy*, and signifies *to buy from* or *out of*, implying that Christ has redeemed, i. e., bought us from or out of the claims or power of the law, so as to deliver us from the penalty which it inflicts on transgressors, as the Apostle states, chapter iii. 13: 'Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law.'

2. "The connection in which these terms are used is sufficient to convince the plain English reader, without any reference to the original, that redemption by price or purchase is intended. It is said that 'Christ gave himself for us that he might redeem us.' 1 Pet. i. 18, 19: 'Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ.' These forms of expression clearly imply that a price was paid for our redemption, and that the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ constituted such price.

"This view is farther supported by other expressions which represent us as being purchased, bought, &c. Acts xx. 28: 'Feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his blood.' 1 Cor. vi. 20: 'Ye are bought with a price, therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are his.' 2 Pet. ii. 1:

'There shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them.' In the first of these texts the Church is said to be bought, and the blood of Christ is stated to have been the price paid. In the second of the above texts the Corinthians are said to be bought with a price, and what was that price more or less than the sufferings and death of Christ, 'who gave himself a ransom for all?' In the third of the above quotations, some persons are said to deny the Lord that bought them; therefore they must have been bought."—*Lee.*

"It has been attempted to evade the literal import of the important terms on which we have dwelt, by urging that such an interpretation would involve the absurdity of paying a price to Satan, the power said to hold men captive at his will.

"But why should the idea of redemption be confined to the purchasing of a captive? The reason appears to be, that the objection may be invested with some plausibility. The fact, however, is, that this is but one species and instance of redemption; for the word, in its proper and general sense, means deliverance from evil of any kind, a price or valuable consideration intervening; which valuable consideration may not always be a price, that is, not money, but something done, or something suffered, by which, in the case of commutation of punishment, the lawgiver is satisfied, though no benefit occurs to him; because in punishment respect is not had to the benefit of the lawgiver, but to the common good and order of things. So when Zaleucus, the Locrian lawgiver, had to pass sentence upon his son, for a crime which, by his own laws, condemned the aggressor to the loss of both his eyes, rather than relax his laws by sparing his son, he ordered him to be deprived of one of his eyes, and submitted to be deprived of one himself. Thus the eye of Zaleucus was the price of that of his son.

"But even if the redemption in Scripture related

wholly to captivity, it does not follow that the price must be paid to him who detains the captive. Our captivity to Satan is not parallel to the case of a captive taken in war, and in whom, by the laws of war, the captor has obtained a right, and demands an equivalent for liberation and the renunciation of that right. Our captivity to Satan is judicial. Man listens to temptation, violates the laws of God, joins in a rebellion against his authority, and his being left under the power of Satan is a part of his punishment. The satisfaction is, therefore, to be made to the law under which this captivity is made a part of the penalty; not to him who detains the captive, and who is but a permitted instrument in the execution of the law, but to him whose law has been violated. He who pays the price of redemption has to do with the judicial authority, and, his price being accepted, he proceeds to rescue the object of his compassion, and becomes the actual redeemer.

The price in the case of man is the blood of Christ; and our redemption is not a commutation of a pecuniary price for a person, but a commutation of the sufferings of one person in the stead of another, which sufferings being a punishment, in order to satisfaction, is a valuable consideration, and, therefore, a price for the redemption of man out of the hands of Satan, and from all the consequences of that captivity.

Under this head, now that we are showing that the death of Christ is exhibited in Scripture as the price of our redemption, it may also be necessary to meet another objection, that this doctrine of purchase and commutation is inconsistent with that freeness of the grace of God in the forgiveness of sins, on which so great a stress is laid in the Scriptures. This objection has been urged from Socinus to Dr. Priestley, and has been thus stated by the latter: 'The Scriptures uniformly represent God as our universal parent, pardoning sinners *freely*, that is, from his natural goodness and mercy, whenever they repent and reform their lives. All the

declarations of Divine mercy are made, without reserve and limitation, to the truly penitent, through all the books of Scripture, without the most distant hint of any regard being had to the sufferings or merit of any being whatever.' The proofs which he gives of this bold, and, indeed, impudent position, are chiefly the declaration of the Apostle, that we are justified *freely* by the grace of God, and he contends that the word *freely* 'implies that forgiveness is the *free gift* of God, and proceeds from his essential goodness and mercy, *without regard to any foreign consideration whatever.*' It is singular, however, that the position, as Dr. Priestley has put it in the above quotations, refutes itself; for even he restricts the exercise of the mercy of God, 'to the truly penitent,' 'to them who repent and reform their lives.' Forgiveness, therefore, is not, even according to him and his followers, free in the sense of unconditional; and at the very time he denies that pardon is bestowed by God, 'without regard to any consideration whatever, foreign to his essential goodness and mercy,' he acknowledges that it is regulated, in its exercise, by the consideration of the penitence or non-penitence of the guilty, who are the subjects of it, from which the contradictory conclusion follows, that, in bestowing mercy, God has respect to a consideration *foreign to his goodness and mercy*, even the penitence of man, so that there is, in the mode of dispensing mercy, a reserve and limitation on the part of God.

"Thus, then, unless they would let in all kinds of license, by preaching an unconditional pardon, Unitarians are obliged to acknowledge that a thing may be done *freely*, which is, nevertheless, not done unconditionally.

"But the very passage of St. Paul to which Dr. Priestly refers, when he contends that the doctrine of the New Testament is, 'that forgiveness is the *free* gift of God, and proceeds from his essential goodness and mercy, without regard to any foreign consideration what-

ever,' refutes his inference. The passage is, 'being justified *freely* by his grace, through the *redemption which is in Christ Jesus.*' The same doctrine is taught in other passages; and so far is it from being true, that no reference is made to any consideration beyond the mere goodness and mercy of God, that consideration is stated in so many express words, 'through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus;' of which redemption the blood of Christ is the price, as taught in the texts above commented on. But though it was convenient, in order to render a bold assertion more plausible, to keep this out of sight, a little reflection might have shown that the argument built upon the word freely, the term used by the Apostle, proceeds upon an entire mistake. The expression has reference to ourselves and to our own exertions in the work of justification, not to any thing which has been done by another in our behalf; and it is here used to denote the manner in which the blessing is bestowed, not the means by which it is procured. 'Being justified *freely* by his grace'—*freely* in the way of a gift unmerited by us, and not in the way of a reward for our worthiness or desert, agreeably to the assertion of the Apostle in another place, 'not by the works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us.' To be justified is to be pardoned and treated as righteous in the sight of God, and to be admitted thus into his favor and acceptance. But man, in his fallen state, had nothing in himself, and could do nothing of himself, by which he might merit or claim as his due so great a benefit. Having, therefore, no pretensions to real righteousness, our absolution from the guilt of sin, and our admission to the character and privileges of righteous persons, must be imputed not to our merit, but to the grace of God; it is an act of mercy which we must acknowledge and receive as a free gift, and not demand as a just reward. Nor do the means by which our justification was effected in any respect alter its nature as a gift, or in the least

diminish its freedom. 'We are justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ;' but this redemption was not procured by us, nor provided at our expense. It was the result of the pure love of God, who, compassionating our misery, himself provided the means of our deliverance, by sending his only begotten Son into the world, who voluntarily submitted to die upon the cross, that he might become the propitiation for our sins, and reconcile us to God. Thus is the whole an entire act of mercy on the part of God and Christ; begun and completed for our benefit, but without our intervention; and, therefore, with respect to us, the pardon of sin must still be accounted a gift, though it comes to us through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ.—*Watson.*

Another objection urged by our opponents against this doctrine of redemption or vicarious atonement, is, as we have already seen thus stated by the Rev. Mr. Grundy: "This doctrine converts justice into vengeance. It first plunges its sword into the soul of the innocent; it afterwards pursues multitudes of those whose punishment he bore, and relentlessly plunges them into the flames of hell." And in this objection Mr. Grundy is followed by those Unitarians who call themselves by the name of Christians, as will appear from the following exclamation once made in the presence of the writer by one of their preachers, (the Rev. Harry Ashly.) "What! seize upon the innocent Jesus and compel him to suffer for guilty man, and then call it eternal justice!" The same objection was, in substance, also made by the Rev. James Hayes, in the controversy before alluded to in this work. But in answer to this we would say, that so far was the Saviour from being seized and compelled to suffer, that he laid down his life voluntarily. John x. 11. "I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep." John x. 17, 18. "Therefore doth my father love me because I lay down my life for the sheep

that I may take it again." "No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it again." The Saviour then, instead of being seized and compelled to suffer and die in the place of fallen and guilty man, voluntarily laid down his life and became obedient to death, even the death of the cross; and while he thus suffered and died of his own free will, it was also in accordance with the will of the Father. Where, then, is the injustice in his thus giving himself a ransom for a guilty world?

2. If, as our opponents contend, Christ could not suffer in the place of sinners without suffering unjustly, God is unjust; for it is expressly said that the Lord hath laid upon him the iniquities of us all. Again, "he (God) hath made him to be sin for us who know no sin." And still farther, it is said, "he (God) hath made him to be a curse for us." How can an innocent being have the iniquities of us all laid upon him in any other way than by having the punishment due to our sins laid upon him? How could God make the Saviour, who, as the Scriptures say, knew no sin, to be sin for us only by inflicting upon him the punishment to which we were exposed in consequence of violating the laws of a just and holy God? Or how could the Saviour be made a curse for us, unless it was by hanging upon the tree, and there bearing in our stead that curse under which man must have for ever groaned had the Saviour never died? It would have been impossible: therefore, it remains evident that Christ did suffer a vicarious death; and if this was unjust, then the Deity who appointed him thus to bear "the chastisement" or punishment due to our sins must be unjust.

3. That Jesus Christ did suffer and die for man, in some sense cannot be denied even by Unitarians. "Now suppose the act was unjust, on the supposition that his death was vicarious, i. e., in the place of the sinner's death, we ask in what respect it would be less

diminish its freedom. 'We are justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ;' but this redemption was not procured by us, nor provided at our expense. It was the result of the pure love of God, who, compassionating our misery, himself provided the means of our deliverance, by sending his only begotten Son into the world, who voluntarily submitted to die upon the cross, that he might become the propitiation for our sins, and reconcile us to God. Thus is the whole an entire act of mercy on the part of God and Christ; begun and completed for our benefit, but without our intervention; and, therefore, with respect to us, the pardon of sin must still be accounted a gift, though it comes to us through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ.—*Watson.*

Another objection urged by our opponents against this doctrine of redemption or vicarious atonement, is, as we have already seen thus stated by the Rev. Mr. Grundy: "This doctrine converts justice into vengeance. It first plunges its sword into the soul of the innocent; it afterwards pursues multitudes of those whose punishment he bore, and relentlessly plunges them into the flames of hell." And in this objection Mr. Grundy is followed by those Unitarians who call themselves by the name of Christians, as will appear from the following exclamation once made in the presence of the writer by one of their preachers, (the Rev. Harry Ashly.) "What! seize upon the innocent Jesus and compel him to suffer for guilty man, and then call it eternal justice!" The same objection was, in substance, also made by the Rev. James Hayes, in the controversy before alluded to in this work. But in answer to this we would say, that so far was the Saviour from being seized and compelled to suffer, that he laid down his life voluntarily. John x. 11. "I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep." John x. 17, 18. "Therefore doth my father love me because I lay down my life for the sheep

that I may take it again." "No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it again." The Saviour then, instead of being seized and compelled to suffer and die in the place of fallen and guilty man, voluntarily laid down his life and became obedient to death, even the death of the cross; and while he thus suffered and died of his own free will, it was also in accordance with the will of the Father. Where, then, is the injustice in his thus giving himself a ransom for a guilty world?

2. If, as our opponents contend, Christ could not suffer in the place of sinners without suffering unjustly, God is unjust; for it is expressly said that the Lord hath laid upon him the iniquities of us all. Again, "he (God) hath made him to be sin for us who know no sin." And still farther, it is said, "he (God) hath made him to be a curse for us." How can an innocent being have the iniquities of us all laid upon him in any other way than by having the punishment due to our sins laid upon him? How could God make the Saviour, who, as the Scriptures say, knew no sin, to be sin for us only by inflicting upon him the punishment to which we were exposed in consequence of violating the laws of a just and holy God? Or how could the Saviour be made a curse for us, unless it was by hanging upon the tree, and there bearing in our stead that curse under which man must have for ever groaned had the Saviour never died? It would have been impossible: therefore, it remains evident that Christ did suffer a vicarious death; and if this was unjust, then the Deity who appointed him thus to bear "the chastisement" or punishment due to our sins must be unjust.

3. That Jesus Christ did suffer and die for man, in some sense cannot be denied even by Unitarians. "Now suppose the act was unjust, on the supposition that his death was vicarious, i. e., in the place of the sinner's death, we ask in what respect it would be less

unjust on the supposition that it was not vicarious? Is it *unjust* for Christ to die to redeem the world, by giving his life a ransom for the forfeited lives of sinners, while it is *just* for him to die under circumstances in every respect similar, with the exception that his death is not a ransom for the lives of sinners? If Christ suffered vicariously for sinners, his death contemplated a greater amount of good than it could have done had he died merely as a martyr for the truth; hence, if our opponents prefer the charge of injustice against the doctrine of Christ's vicarious death, they aggravate the circumstance of injustice in proportion as they lessen the amount of good to be secured by it, by denying its atoning merits."—*Lee.*

4. It is not, as Mr. Grundy says, "this doctrine which plunges the sword into the soul of the innocent," but Jehovah himself who thus exclaims, in view of the death of Christ "Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow. Smite the shepherd." Zach. xiii. 7. Here the Lord (Jehovah) is heard calling upon the sword to awake against his shepherd, and the man that is his fellow, who is Christ, for the purpose of smiting him. Is this unjust? Let Unitarians answer. If they say that it is, then Deity himself must stand branded with injustice. But if, to avoid this conclusion, they withdraw their charge, and grant that God was just when he called upon the sword to awake and smite the Saviour, and when it pleased the Lord to wound and bruise him for our transgressions, or lay upon him the iniquities of us all, then the above objection loses all its force.

5. If the above objection is founded in truth, it will follow, not only that the Father who sent his Son to die for our sins is unjust, but the charge of injustice will lay with equal force against the Son, for he did "die for our sins according to the Scriptures." "He died, the just, for the unjust." He gave his life for the sheep, and if it is unjust for "the innocent Jesus" to suffer

for guilty man, then the Saviour, when he thus voluntarily suffered and died, must have been guilty of an act of injustice. We therefore see that if Unitarianism be true, we have both an unjust God and an unjust Saviour.

The same remarks will apply with equal force to the charge of injustice on the part of God, in punishing the sinner, although Christ has suffered "the just for the unjust," for that he has thus suffered has been abundantly proved, and that those who refuse to accept of offered mercy will be punished is obvious, from the following testimony of Divine truth: "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God." The wicked shall be driven away in his wickedness, the righteous only hath hope in his death. "These (the wicked) shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." "Depart ye cursed into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels." "Their worm dieth not, and their fire is not quenched." "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and who obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power." These passages plainly prove that the finally wicked will at last receive the punishment due to their sins, while others which have been noticed prove with equal clearness that Christ did suffer in our stead: therefore, if this is an unjust course of proceeding, then God is an unjust being.

But all difficulty on this subject, and every appearance of injustice, will disappear when we recollect that the blood of the Saviour is the blood of "a covenant which demands 'repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ,' 'for the remission of sins,'—the 'faithfulness and justice' which require the absolution of those who, with a proper reference to the

unjust on the supposition that it was not vicarious? Is it *unjust* for Christ to die to redeem the world, by giving his life a ransom for the forfeited lives of sinners, while it is *just* for him to die under circumstances in every respect similar, with the exception that his death is not a ransom for the lives of sinners? If Christ suffered vicariously for sinners, his death contemplated a greater amount of good than it could have done had he died merely as a martyr for the truth; hence, if our opponents prefer the charge of injustice against the doctrine of Christ's vicarious death, they aggravate the circumstance of injustice in proportion as they lessen the amount of good to be secured by it, by denying its atoning merits."—*Lee.*

4. It is not, as Mr. Grundy says, "this doctrine which plunges the sword into the soul of the innocent," but Jehovah himself who thus exclaims, in view of the death of Christ "Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow. Smite the shepherd." Zach. xiii. 7. Here the Lord (Jehovah) is heard calling upon the sword to awake against his shepherd, and the man that is his fellow, who is Christ, for the purpose of smiting him. Is this unjust? Let Unitarians answer. If they say that it is, then Deity himself must stand branded with injustice. But if, to avoid this conclusion, they withdraw their charge, and grant that God was just when he called upon the sword to awake and smite the Saviour, and when it pleased the Lord to wound and bruise him for our transgressions, or lay upon him the iniquities of us all, then the above objection loses all its force.

5. If the above objection is founded in truth, it will follow, not only that the Father who sent his Son to die for our sins is unjust, but the charge of injustice will lay with equal force against the Son, for he did "die for our sins according to the Scriptures." "He died, the just, for the unjust." He gave his life for the sheep, and if it is unjust for "the innocent Jesus" to suffer

for guilty man, then the Saviour, when he thus voluntarily suffered and died, must have been guilty of an act of injustice. We therefore see that if Unitarianism be true, we have both an unjust God and an unjust Saviour.

The same remarks will apply with equal force to the charge of injustice on the part of God, in punishing the sinner, although Christ has suffered "the just for the unjust," for that he has thus suffered has been abundantly proved, and that those who refuse to accept of offered mercy will be punished is obvious, from the following testimony of Divine truth: "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God." The wicked shall be driven away in his wickedness, the righteous only hath hope in his death. "These (the wicked) shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." "Depart ye cursed into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels." "Their worm dieth not, and their fire is not quenched." "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and who obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power." These passages plainly prove that the finally wicked will at last receive the punishment due to their sins, while others which have been noticed prove with equal clearness that Christ did suffer in our stead: therefore, if this is an unjust course of proceeding, then God is an unjust being.

But all difficulty on this subject, and every appearance of injustice, will disappear when we recollect that the blood of the Saviour is the blood of "a covenant which demands 'repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ,' 'for the remission of sins,'—the 'faithfulness and justice' which require the absolution of those who, with a proper reference to the

propitiatory sacrifice, 'confess their sins,' do not require the absolution of those who obstinately continue in their sin and unbelief. 'God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life,' John iii. 16. They, therefore, who obstinately refuse to believe in him, are justly left to 'die in their iniquity.' 'If we sin wilfully (by rejecting reconciliation) after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a fearful looking for of judgment, and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries.' The sinner, then, is justly charged, not only with the sins, the pardon of which he has obstinately refused, but with that of 'treading under foot the Son of God,' and of 'counting the blood of the covenant a common thing.' In other words, the end of public justice is not answered by the death of Christ, in those who live and die impenitent, and therefore must be answered by the exercise of distributive justice."—*Hare.*

It is also objected that if Jesus Christ suffered in our stead, for the purpose of saving us from the curse and penalty of the Divine Law, and if, as Trinitarians contend, the penalty of the Law is eternal death, then Christ must suffer eternally.

In answer to this we would say, that it was not necessary for Christ to suffer the same length of time that the sinner would have been under the necessity of suffering if no atonement had ever been made, for his nature was such, being both God and man, that he was capable of suffering as much in a short period as the sinner will be through eternity. Let no one, however, infer from this that we suppose the Divine nature itself suffered, for as Divinity is unchangeable it is impossible that it should suffer in the least degree as suffering if applied to Deity would imply a change. But notwithstanding the Divine nature of Christ could not in itself suffer, yet it could, and undoubtedly did support the

humanity in its suffering for sinners. In the second place we would remark that it was not necessary that Jesus should suffer as *much* as the transgressor, in order to satisfy the claims of the Law, for his sufferings were of more value than any or every created being. Yea, the union of the Divine with the human nature, in the person of Jesus Christ, stamped his suffering with infinite merit: of this we may assure ourselves by reasoning from the less to the greater. A clod of the valley, for instance, is of no real worth or dignity; it is not capable of suffering, and if it was, its sufferings could not possess any merit. But let that clod of the valley or heap of earth, that lays thus incapable of suffering, be connected with a spirit as it is in man, and it is not only rendered susceptible of pain and suffering but there is immediately a new dignity stamped upon it, so that its sufferings are of great value in behalf of any one. But if being connected with a finite created spirit increases the value of its suffering in such a ratio, what must be the value of those sufferings when connected with an infinite spirit as in the case of Jesus Christ? Or, we may reason thus, if the sufferings of man are of more value than those of a brute, and those of an angel than those of a man, it will follow as we proceed in this gradation, *ad infinitum*, and can find a being whose nature has no bounds his sufferings will be of infinite value. Such was the nature of Jesus Christ, our atoning high priest, for he was God manifest in the flesh, and as such his sufferings, though of short duration, must have been of infinite worth; consequently he could bear the curse of the divine law, and thereby make it possible for God to be just, and yet the justifier of him that believeth without suffering eternally, therefore, the above objection looses all its force, and like many others which have been noticed, disappears before the blaze of gospel truth.

But Unitarians contend that the dignity of the person adds nothing to the merit of his suffering. "The

common opinion of mankind, in all ages, is, however, a sufficient refutation of this objection, for in proportion to the excellence of the creatures immolated in sacrifice have the value and efficacy of oblations been estimated by all people; which notion when perverted, made them resort, in some instances, to human sacrifices, in cases of great extremity; and surely, if the principle of substitution existed in the penal law of any human government, it would be universally felt to make a great difference in the character of the law, whether an honorable or a mean substitute were exacted in place of the guilty; and that it would have greatly changed the character of the act of Zaleucus, the Locrian lawgiver, and placed the estimation in which he held his own laws, and the degree of strictness with which he was determined to uphold them, in a very different light, if, instead of parting with one of his own eyes, in place of the remaining eye of his son, he had ordered the eye of some base slave or of a malefactor to be plucked out. But without entering into this, the notion will be explicitly refuted, if we turn to the testimony of Holy Writ itself, in which the dignity and Divinity of our Lord are so often emphatically referred to as stamping that *value* upon his sacrifice, as giving that *consideration* to his voluntary sufferings on our account, which we usually express by the term of '*his merits*,' Acts xx. 28, as GOD, he is said to have 'purchased the church with HIS OWN BLOOD.' In Colossians i. 14, 15, we are said to have 'redemption through HIS BLOOD, who is THE IMAGE OF THE INVISIBLE GOD.' In 1 Cor. ii. 8, 'the LORD OF GLORY is said to have been CRUCIFIED.' St. Peter emphatically calls the blood of Christ 'PRECIOUS BLOOD;' and St. Paul dwells particularly upon this peculiarity, when he contrasts the sacrifice of Christ with those of the law, and when he ascribes that purifying efficacy, which he denies to the blood of bulls and of goats, to the blood of Christ. 'HOW MUCH MORE shall the BLOOD OF CHRIST, who

through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God.' By the argument of our opponents there could be no difference between the blood of animals, shed under the law, as to value and efficacy, and the blood of Christ, which is directly in the teeth of the declaration and argument of the Apostle, who also asserts, that the *patterns* of things in the heavens were purified by animal sacrifices; 'but the heavenly things themselves with BETTER SACRIFICES than these,' namely, the oblation of Christ."—*Watson.*

We think we have now succeeded in showing that the doctrine of a vicarious atonement is a doctrine clearly taught in the sacred Scriptures, and having answered the most prominent objections urged against it, we will now bring this subject to a close by remarking in the language of the Rev. Mr. Lee, that "as christians we can never give up the atonement. What! renounce the atonement, which has already washed away the guilt of sin and given us peace with God through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ—renounce the efficacy of the blood of the cross, the cleansing power of which we have already felt in our souls by blessed experience—renounce the atonement, trusting in which holy Martyrs shouted in the flames—renounce the atonement which has dispelled the horrors of death and shed the light of eternity on the night of the grave—renounce the atonement, while redeemed spirits which have already gained the blest shore, ascribe their salvation to the blood of the Lamb as they surround the throne with songs of deliverance, saying, 'Unto him that loved us and hath washed us from our sins in his own blood, be glory and dominion forever and ever: thou art worthy for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood.' No, heaven forbid it! Holy Ghost inspire us, and the atonement shall be our rallying point forever."

CHAPTER IX.

OBJECTIONS TO UNITARIANISM.

I. If Unitarianism is true, the Bible must be false; for it expressly says that the Word (which is Christ) was God. Unitarianism says he is nothing but a creature. The Bible says that Christ was from everlasting; while Unitarianism says that he was not, but had a beginning. The Bible says that our Saviour knew *all* things; but Unitarianism affirms that he was ignorant of many things. The Bible says of Christ that he is the Almighty, the mighty God; Unitarianism denies that he possesses this attribute, and contends that he is limited in all his energies. In the Bible, also, our Saviour promises always to be with his followers, and to meet with his children wherever they shall be assembled in his name, and, therefore, must be omnipresent; Unitarianism denies this, and, therefore, contradicts the Bible, and renders it impossible for the Saviour to fulfil his promises. The Bible says that Christ is over all, God blessed forever; Unitarianism says that he is a created being, and therefore cannot be God over all. The Bible says that all things, both in heaven and in earth, were created by and *for* Jesus Christ; Unitarianism says that all things were created by and for the Father, to the exclusion of the Son. We therefore see, that with regard to the character of our Saviour, Unitarianism is at open war with the Scriptures; and that if true, the Bible must be false.

But it is not only with regard to the character of Christ that Unitarians stand opposed to the Bible, but in several other respects. The Bible views the knowledge of the Holy Ghost as unlimited; for it says of him that he searches all things, yea, the deep things of God;

while Unitarianism regards him as nothing but an attribute or emanation, and therefore strips him of all knowledge, and makes him an unintelligent agent. See the answers given to several questions by the Rev. James Hayes, on page 37. Again, the Bible says, "there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one;" Unitarianism says, no, "at the most, there are but two, the Father and the Son, for the Spirit has no personal existence; and so far are these three from being one, that the Father is an eternal self-existent being; while the Word, or Son, is a finite created being; besides, it is impossible that two should be one." Thus we see that Unitarianism contradicts the Bible, and, consequently if one is true, the other must be false. Reader, which will you choose? Will you adhere to the Scriptures of Divine, truth which are able to make you wise unto salvation? or will you suspend your eternal all upon a theory which contradicts the Bible, and limits the Saviour in all his attributes?

II. Unitarianism makes the Bible contradict itself, and thereby destroys its claim to Divine inspiration. This will appear from the fact, that in almost numberless instances, many of which have been mentioned in the preceding pages, and therefore need not be repeated here, it expressly declares that there is but one God, while in other places it says that Jesus Christ is God, and also that the Holy Ghost is God; and that, too, under circumstances which forbid us to understand this name as applied to them in any inferior or accommodated sense, as the reader will see by turning to the chapters on the Divinity of Christ and the Holy Ghost. These different passages of Scripture are directly opposed to each other, and can only be reconciled by supposing that these three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, exist together in the undivided Trinity, and together constitute the one God who is the Supreme object of religious worship. But Unitarians deny this,

therefore they have no consistent method of reconciling those passages of Scripture which say there is but one God with those which say that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are God; therefore, upon their hypothesis, the Bible contradicts itself, and must be false.

These, however, are not the only passages of Scripture which contradict each other, if Unitarianism is true. It is said, "thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him *only* shalt thou serve;" and again, "Worship God." But notwithstanding these passages are thus definite in making God the *only* object of worship, others, with equal plainness, bear testimony to the fact that Jesus Christ, who, according to Unitarianism, is nothing but a creature, is an object of worship. "When he bringeth his first begotten into the world he saith, and let all the angels of God worship him." Here the reader will readily see that one passage makes God the *only* object of worship, but the other makes Christ an object of worship; consequently, if Christ is not God, which Unitarians deny, these must contradict each other; and if the Bible constradicts itself, it cannot be true.

The Scriptures, also, upon the one hand inform us that Christ is dependant on the Father; that the Father "does nothing of himself;" that he does "those works which the Father gave him to do;" that "the Son knoweth not the hour of the last judgment;" that "the Father is greater than he;" and that "the Son shall deliver up the kingdom to the Father." On the other hand, they represent him as acting according to his own will; acting with a sovereign authority; acting as absolutely independent. "Be it unto thee even as thou wilt—I will, be thou clean—thy sins be forgiven thee." They also assure us that he is one with the Father, and equal with God; that he "knoweth all things, and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Now if Unitarianism be true, which denies that Christ was both God and man, it will be utterly impossible to reconcile these different passages of Sacred Writ; for if Christ possesses

but one nature, how can he be equal with his Father, and yet inferior to him?

"With what consistency can our opponents maintain that Christ knows all things, and yet is ignorant of the time fixed for one of the greatest events that ever did, or ever will take place in the universe? The distinction between nature and office is of no use here. For knowledge is a property of nature; something, therefore, belonging to the nature of Jesus must be in question. Will they say, 'When Peter declares that our Lord knows all things, that he does not speak in the general?' But what is speaking in the general, if not making use of general expressions? Besides, Peter, from a general principle, draws a particular conclusion. 'Lord, thou knowest all things, thou knowest that I love thee.' As if he had said, Lord, I love thee, and thou must know that I love thee; for thou art not ignorant of any thing. To suppose that the Apostle was under a mistake, when he so expressed himself, has no shadow of reason. Because if he was, he uttered a blasphemy by attributing omniscience to Jesus Christ, which belongs only to God; and because his holy and humble Master would not have rewarded blasphemy by saying, 'Feed my sheep.'

"How can they reconcile those passages which inform us that Christ does nothing of himself; that he prayed at the grave of Lazarus; and that the Father always hears him; with others which represent him as working miracles by his own will and his own power? If he be a mere creature, he depends upon God for his existence every moment, and was entirely beholden to the Great Sovereign for every exertion of power in the performance of his miraculous works. But if so, how came he to speak with such an air of Divine authority and of Divine power, 'I will, be thou clean?' Had Moses or Paul, expressed himself after this manner, he would undoubtedly have been guilty of blasphemy.

Nor can the distinction between office and nature be of the least service on this occasion.

"Nor is their hypothesis any better calculated to reconcile what the Scripture asserts about the perpetuity of our Lord's kingdom, with what it says concerning his delivering of it up to the Father. For as, according to them, he does not reign by nature, but only in virtue of his offices; it does not appear how his kingdom can be eternal. Nay, it necessarily follows that it must come to a period, if his offices do so. The seeming contradictions, therefore, between the different passages, remain in all their force, as to any relief which can be afforded by their hypothesis. If, then, we be able perfectly to reconcile these apparently jarring texts, they must allow that our sentiments have a manifest and great advantage over theirs.

"Though the distinction of nature and office, which is fundamental in their hypothesis, be of no service here, yet ours of two distinct natures in the person of Christ, which is essential to the system embraced by us, is calculated to answer the important end. Nothing more easy, nothing more natural, than to reconcile one Scripture with another on the foundation of this distinction. For example, Jesus Christ is man, and therefore inferior to the Father; he is God, and therefore equal with the Father. He is man, and therefore ignorant of some things; he is God, and therefore must be omniscient. He is man, and therefore must be dependent on the First Cause; he prays and is heard. He is God; to act, therefore, he need only to will; for by willing he commands, and by commanding he executes. 'I will, be thou clean." He is man, and therefore may receive a dominion, which is not natural to him; may also receive it for a certain time, after which he shall deliver up his delegated kingdom and dominion to the Father. He is God, and therefore has an everlasting kingdom, a necessary dominion that shall never have an end."—(*Abbadie.*) But if Unitarianism be

true, which denies this distinction of two natures in Christ, these *apparent* contradictions become *real* ones, and thereby the truth of the Sacred Scriptures are destroyed. So forcibly is the above difficulty felt by many Unitarians, that they have openly declared that the Bible is contradictory, and positively denied that it was given by Divine inspiration. Of this the reader will be satisfied when he reads the following extracts from the writings of the Rev. John Grundy:

"In the writings of the Evangelists there are *inconsistencies* and occasional *contradictions* which, in my estimation, render it utterly impossible that they should have written under the influence of a Divine inspiration.

"The writers of the New Testament often make quotations from the Old Testament in a very *incorrect* manner. Is it not a grievous reflection upon the moral character of the Deity to represent him as dictating a quotation from a Prophet to different writers, and yet inspiring them to give that quotation inaccurately and variously?

"They often speak with such uncertainty as to render it incredible that the sentiment was at the time dictated by the Spirit of God.

"The reasonings with which the books composing the New Testament abound, evidently show that they were not written under the influence of plenary inspiration."

Dr. Priestley says, as before quoted, "I think I have shown that the Apostle Paul often reasons inconclusively, and, therefore, that he wrote as any other person of his turn of mind or thinking, and in his situation, would have written without any particular inspiration."

We will now listen to Rev. Theodore Parker, who says, in his sermon, mentioned on a former page, "Who shall assure us that they [the writers of the New Testament] were not sometimes mistaken in historical, as

well as doctrinal matters, did not sometimes confound the actual with the imaginary, and that the fancy of these pious writers never stood in the place of their recollection?

"It has been assumed, at the outset, it would seem, with no sufficient reason, without the smallest pretence on its writers' parts, that all of its authors were infallibly and miraculously inspired, so that they could commit no error of doctrine or fact. Men have been bid to close their eyes at the obvious difference between Luke and John; the serious disagreement between Paul and Peter; to believe on the smallest evidence, accounts which shock the moral sense and revolt the reason.

"Hence the attempt which always fails, to reconcile the philosophy of our times with the poems in Genesis, written a thousand years before Christ; hence the attempt to conceal the contradiction in the record itself. Matters have come to such a pass, that even now, he is deemed an infidel, if not by implication an atheist, whose reverence for the Most High forbids him to believe that God commanded Abraham to sacrifice his son, a thought at which the flesh creeps with horror; to believe it solely on the authority of an oriential story, written down nobody knows when, or by whom, or for what purpose; which may be a poem, but cannot be the record of fact, unless God is the author of confusion and a lie.

"On the authority of the written word, man was taught to believe fiction for fact; a dream for a miraculous revelation of God; an oriental poem for a grave history of miraculous events; a collection of amatory idyls [love songs] for a serious discourse 'touching the mutual love of Christ and the Church.'

"No doubt the time will come when its true character will be felt. Then it will be seen, that, amid all the contradictions of the Old Testament; its legends so beautiful as fictions, so appaling as facts; amid its pre-

dictions that have never been fulfilled; amid the puerile conceptions of God which sometimes occur, and the cruel denunciations that disfigure both Psalm and Prophecy, there is a reverence for man's nature, a sublime trust in God, and a depth of piety rarely felt in these cold northern hearts of ours."

Such is the language of Unitarian divines. We will now present the reader with an extract from the pen of Rosseau, a noted French infidel, and then leave him to judge which has the greatest claim to the name of Christian, Rosseau, an avowed skeptic, or the gentlemen from whose writings the above extracts have been taken.

"I will confess to you that the majesty of the Scriptures strikes me with admiration, as the purity of the gospel has its influence on my heart. Peruse the works of our philosophers, with all their pomp of diction: how mean, how contemptible they are compared with the Scriptures! Is it possible that a book, at once so simple and sublime, should be merely the work of a man? Is it possible that the sacred personage whose history it contains, should be a mere man? Do we find that he assumed the tone of an enthusiast or the ambitious sectary? What sweetness, what purity in his manners! What an affecting gracefulness in his delivery! What sublimity in his maxims! What presence of mind in his replies! How great the command over his passions! Where is the man, where the philosopher, who could so live and so die, without weakness and without ostentation? When Plato described his imaginary good man with all the shame of guilt, yet meriting the highest rewards of virtue, he described exactly the character of Jesus Christ: the resemblance was so striking that all the Christian Fathers perceived it.

"What prepossession, what blindness must it be to compare the son of Sophronicus (Socrates) to the son of Mary! What an infinite disproportion is there between them! Socrates dying without pain or ignominy,

Nor can the distinction between office and nature be of the least service on this occasion.

"Nor is their hypothesis any better calculated to reconcile what the Scripture asserts about the perpetuity of our Lord's kingdom, with what it says concerning his delivering of it up to the Father. For as, according to them, he does not reign by nature, but only in virtue of his offices; it does not appear how his kingdom can be eternal. Nay, it necessarily follows that it must come to a period, if his offices do so. The seeming contradictions, therefore, between the different passages, remain in all their force, as to any relief which can be afforded by their hypothesis. If, then, we be able perfectly to reconcile these apparently jarring texts, they must allow that our sentiments have a manifest and great advantage over theirs.

"Though the distinction of nature and office, which is fundamental in their hypothesis, be of no service here, yet ours of two distinct natures in the person of Christ, which is essential to the system embraced by us, is calculated to answer the important end. Nothing more easy, nothing more natural, than to reconcile one Scripture with another on the foundation of this distinction. For example, Jesus Christ is man, and therefore inferior to the Father; he is God, and therefore equal with the Father. He is man, and therefore ignorant of some things; he is God, and therefore must be omniscient. He is man, and therefore must be dependent on the First Cause; he prays and is heard. He is God; to act, therefore, he need only to will; for by willing he commands, and by commanding he executes. 'I will, be thou clean." He is man, and therefore may receive a dominion, which is not natural to him; may also receive it for a certain time, after which he shall deliver up his delegated kingdom and dominion to the Father. He is God, and therefore has an everlasting kingdom, a necessary dominion that shall never have an end."—(*Abbadie.*) But if Unitarianism be

true, which denies this distinction of two natures in Christ, these *apparent* contradictions become *real* ones, and thereby the truth of the Sacred Scriptures are destroyed. So forcibly is the above difficulty felt by many Unitarians, that they have openly declared that the Bible is contradictory, and positively denied that it was given by Divine inspiration. Of this the reader will be satisfied when he reads the following extracts from the writings of the Rev. John Grundy:

"In the writings of the Evangelists there are *inconsistencies* and occasional *contradictions* which, in my estimation, render it utterly impossible that they should have written under the influence of a Divine inspiration.

"The writers of the New Testament often make quotations from the Old Testament in a very *incorrect* manner. Is it not a grievous reflection upon the moral character of the Deity to represent him as dictating a quotation from a Prophet to different writers, and yet inspiring them to give that quotation inaccurately and variously?

"They often speak with such uncertainty as to render it incredible that the sentiment was at the time dictated by the Spirit of God.

"The reasonings with which the books composing the New Testament abound, evidently show that they were not written under the influence of plenary inspiration."

Dr. Priestley says, as before quoted, "I think I have shown that the Apostle Paul often reasons inconclusively, and, therefore, that he wrote as any other person of his turn of mind or thinking, and in his situation, would have written without any particular inspiration."

We will now listen to Rev. Theodore Parker, who says, in his sermon, mentioned on a former page, "Who shall assure us that they [the writers of the New Testament] were not sometimes mistaken in historical, as

well as doctrinal matters, did not sometimes confound the actual with the imaginary, and that the fancy of these pious writers never stood in the place of their recollection?

"It has been assumed, at the outset, it would seem, with no sufficient reason, without the smallest pretence on its writers' parts, that all of its authors were infallibly and miraculously inspired, so that they could commit no error of doctrine or fact. Men have been bid to close their eyes at the obvious difference between Luke and John; the serious disagreement between Paul and Peter; to believe on the smallest evidence, accounts which shock the moral sense and revolt the reason.

"Hence the attempt which always fails, to reconcile the philosophy of our times with the poems in Genesis, written a thousand years before Christ; hence the attempt to conceal the contradiction in the record itself. Matters have come to such a pass, that even now, he is deemed an infidel, if not by implication an atheist, whose reverence for the Most High forbids him to believe that God commanded Abraham to sacrifice his son, a thought at which the flesh creeps with horror; to believe it solely on the authority of an oriential story, written down nobody knows when, or by whom, or for what purpose; which may be a poem, but cannot be the record of fact, unless God is the author of confusion and a lie.

"On the authority of the written word, man was taught to believe fiction for fact; a dream for a miraculous revelation of God; an oriental poem for a grave history of miraculous events; a collection of amatory idyls [love songs] for a serious discourse 'touching the mutual love of Christ and the Church.'

"No doubt the time will come when its true character will be felt. Then it will be seen, that, amid all the contradictions of the Old Testament; its legends so beautiful as fictions, so appaling as facts; amid its pre-

dictions that have never been fulfilled; amid the puerile conceptions of God which sometimes occur, and the cruel denunciations that disfigure both Psalm and Prophecy, there is a reverence for man's nature, a sublime trust in God, and a depth of piety rarely felt in these cold northern hearts of ours."

Such is the language of Unitarian divines. We will now present the reader with an extract from the pen of Rosseau, a noted French infidel, and then leave him to judge which has the greatest claim to the name of Christian, Rosseau, an avowed skeptic, or the gentlemen from whose writings the above extracts have been taken.

"I will confess to you that the majesty of the Scriptures strikes me with admiration, as the purity of the gospel has its influence on my heart. Peruse the works of our philosophers, with all their pomp of diction: how mean, how contemptible they are compared with the Scriptures! Is it possible that a book, at once so simple and sublime, should be merely the work of a man? Is it possible that the sacred personage whose history it contains, should be a mere man? Do we find that he assumed the tone of an enthusiast or the ambitious sectary? What sweetness, what purity in his manners! What an affecting gracefulness in his delivery! What sublimity in his maxims! What presence of mind in his replies! How great the command over his passions! Where is the man, where the philosopher, who could so live and so die, without weakness and without ostentation? When Plato described his imaginary good man with all the shame of guilt, yet meriting the highest rewards of virtue, he described exactly the character of Jesus Christ: the resemblance was so striking that all the Christian Fathers perceived it.

"What prepossession, what blindness must it be to compare the son of Sophronicus (Socrates) to the son of Mary! What an infinite disproportion is there between them! Socrates dying without pain or ignominy,

easily supported his character to the last: and if his death, however easy, had not crowned his life, it might have been doubted whether Socrates, with all his wisdom, was any thing more than a vain sophist. He invented, it is said, the theory of morals. Others, however, had before put them in practice: he had only to say, therefore, what they had done, and to reduce their examples to precept. But where could Jesus learn among his competitors that pure and sublime morality, of which he only has given us both precept and example? The death of Socrates, peaceably philosophizing with his friends, appears the most agreeable that could be wished for; that of Jesus, expiring in the midst of agonizing pains, abused, insulted, and accused by a whole nation, is the most horrible that could be feared. Socrates, in receiving the cup of poison, blest the weeping executioner who gave it; but Jesus, in the midst of excrutiating tortures, prayed for his merciless tormentors. Yes! if the life and death of Socrates were those of a sage, the life and death of Jesus were those of a God. Shall we suppose the evangelic history a mere fiction? Indeed, my friend, it bears not the marks of fiction; on the contrary, the history of Socrates, which nobody presumes to doubt, is not so well attested as that of Jesus Christ. Such a supposition, in fact, only shifts the difficulty, without obviating it; it is more inconceivable, that a number of persons should agree to write such a history, than that one only should furnish the subject of it. The Jewish authors were incapable of the diction and strangers to the morality contained in the gospel, the marks of whose truth are so striking and inimitable, that the inventor would be a more astonishing man than the hero."

The reader now has before him the language of Unitarianism and the language of infidelity; and in view of the contrast, we think he will justify us in saying that the language of Unitarianism is not so becoming the Christian religion as the language of Rosseau, an open

and avowed skeptic; and, with the editor of the Western Christian Advocate, "That Unitarianism is not only diametrically opposed in its principles to Christianity, but that its very forces are arrayed against it. When we speak of Christianity we mean Christianity: we do not mean a few statements extracted by a conceited rationalism from the word of God, and then compounded with metaphysical imagining and philosophical suppositions: we mean that vast and comprehensive system of divine things which was shadowed forth under the patriarchal and Mosaic dispensations of grace, and which burst forth in the fullness of splendor during the ministry of Christ and his Apostles. We receive as an eternal and unchangeable truth, direct from the throne of the Supreme himself, 'ALL *Scripture* is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.' We believe in the Bible—the whole Bible—and nothing but the Bible; and we tremble for the future destiny of those who trifle with its solemn contents when we read its closing words: 'If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book; and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.'

"It seems strange, unprecedentedly strange, that after Hobbes, and Shaftsbury, and Hume, and Paine, and Volney, and Voltaire, and a host of others, should have expended the energies of their nature in opposing the Christian revelation, and all to no effect, its *professed* friends should turn round and blaspheme its momentous truths—should proclaim, in the assumed capacity of ministers of the gospel, that it contains 'puerile conceptions of God,' and that 'cruel denunciations disfigure both Psalm and Prophecy.'"

III. If Unitarianism be true, then the Mahometan religion is an essential reformation of Christianity.

"That there is an infinite distance between the Creator and the creature, is a principle of natural religion. God cannot, therefore, without the most hateful impiety, be treated as a creature; nor can a creature, without the grossest idolatry, be treated as a God. If, then, Jesus Christ be the Creator, he cannot be said, without impiety, to be a mere creature: and, if he be a mere creature, he cannot, without idolatry, be acknowledged as God. Consequently, if we who consider him, as of one essence with the Father, and the eternal God, be under a mistake, we cannot be cleared from a charge of idolatry, since it is as such that we worship him.

"We can not justify our conduct by saying, 'we sincerely believe him to be God; so that though there is an error in our judgment, yet there is no infidelity in our hearts, our worship being directed to God only.' For the same reason might serve to excuse all idolaters past, present, and future. The Heathens, who worshipped their Jupiter, really believed him to be God, and their acts of worship were intentionally referred to the Supreme Being; yet they were not the less idolatrous on that account.

"Nor ought we to imagine that a creature, on account of its superior excellence, may become the object of worship, which it would not be lawful to give to one of an inferior order. For they who worship the stars are as really idolaters as those that worship wood and stone; and they who worship angels, as those that worship the stars: because idolatry does not consist in rendering divine honors to a creature that is *comparatively low* in the scale of dependant existence; but in addressing them to *a mere creature*."—(*Abbadie.*) But, says one, "we have no scruples in worshipping Christ, for God has commanded us to worship him." Very true; but this must forever stand as an irrefraga-

ble evidence in favor of his divinity, or else the Bible is again made to contradict itself; for it is expressly written, "thou shalt have no other Gods before me." "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him ONLY shalt thou serve," while at the same time angels and men are commanded to worship and serve Jesus Christ. "If any man *serve me*, him will my Father honor." Now if Jesus Christ is not very God, then we are, in one place, commanded to do what in another we are prohibited from doing on the penalty of death; for what is forbidden on more dreadful pains than idolatry which treats the creature as the creator.

"Again: Idolatry is a crime which violates the law of God and destroys the spirit of piety: it is directly opposite to the two great ends of religion; which are, the Glory of God, and the salvation of our souls. As to the *former*, it evidently robs JEHOVAH of his glory, and invests a creature with it. As to the *latter*, the spirit of infallibility has declared, that 'idolaters shall not inherit the kingdom of God.'

"Hence it follows, that the Christianity we profess is a corruption of the Christian religion; and that Mahometanism is the re-establishment of it. For if Christianity, in its primitive purity, represent and treat Jesus Christ as a mere creature, we corrupt and subvert it, when we consider and worship him as the true God. If, then, the religion of those who worship him as the Supreme Being, be a corruption of Christianity, the Mahometan religion, which represents God as infinitely superior to Jesus Christ, must be, in this respect, the re-establishment of it."—*(Abbadie.)* In this light the subject has been viewed by Unitarians themselves, who have manifested a considerable degree of regard for the character and cause of Mahomet, as will appear from the following address of theirs to Ameth Ben Ameth, Ambassador from the Emperor of Fez and Morocco, to Charles the Second, King of Great Britain:

"We, say they to his Excellency, as your NEAREST FELLOW-CHAMPIONS for those truths: We, who, with our Unitarian brethren, were in all ages exercised to defend with our pens the faith of one Supreme God, (without personalities, or pluralities,) *as He hath raised your Mahomet to do the same* with the sword, as a scourge on those *idolizing Christians*;—We do, *for the vindication of your law-maker's glory*, strive to prove, that such faults and irregularities, [as are found in the Koran] not cohering with the fashion of the rest of the Alcoran building, nor with the undoubted sayings of your prophet, nor with the gospel of Christ (whereof Mahomet would have himself to be but *a preacher*)—were foisted into the scattered papers found after Mahomet's death, of which in truth the Alcoran was made up: it being otherwise impossible that a man of *that* JUDGMENT, *that hath proved itself in other things so* CONSPICUOUSLY, should be guilty of so many and frequent repugnancies, as are to be seen in those writings and laws that are now-a-days given out under his name. We do, then, endeavor to clear by whom, and in what time, such alterations were made in the first setting out of the Alcoran.' See the whole Address in Leslie's *Socinian Controversy Disc.* Pref. p. 3—13. Thus careful were these gentlemen to purge the Koran of every thing suppositious; and thus tender of its author's honor!

Another Unitarian writer represents Mahomet, as having "no other design but to restore the belief of the unity of God; which, says he, at that time was extirpated among the eastern Christians, by the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation, and informs us 'that Mahomet meant not his religion should be esteemed *a new* religion; but only the restitution of the *true intent* of the Christian religion—that the Mahometan learned men call themselves *the true disciples* of the Messias, or Christ; intimating thereby, that Christians are apostates from the MOST ESSENTIAL PARTS of the doctrine

of the Messias—that Mahometanism has prevailed so greatly, not by force and the sword, but by that one truth in the Alcoran, the *unity* of God;" that is, as well in *Person*, as in *Essence*. And then he represents the Tartars as acting more rationally, in embracing what he calls "the *more plausible* sect of Mahomet, than they would have done, in receiving the Christian faith of the Trinity, Incarnation, &c." In Leslie, as above, p. 28.

IV. Unitarianism makes Mahomet more true than Jesus Christ, "at least, in those things which regard the fundamentals of religion and the glory of God. This will appear, from the manner in which our Lord speaks of himself, and how, by the direction of his own Spirit, his apostles represent him in the Scripture testimonies adduced in a preceding chapter, when compared with the following declarations of Mahomet, in which he plainly asserts, that they who say 'The Son of Mary is God, are infidels;' and avers, 'that Christ, the son of Mary, is no more than God's envoy'—that the 'Christians are infidels, by making *three* Gods, when there is but *one*;' and he calls those 'infidels who set up Christ as equal to God.'" These declarations from the Koran are directly opposed to the language of the Bible: "In the *former*, Jesus is described as bearing divine characters and possessing divine perfections, as performing divine works, and as being the true God; but in the *latter*, as a mere creature, and infinitely inferior to Jehovah. The language of the Bible, therefore, and the language of the Koran, cannot be both true, because they are contradictory. But that of the Koran, which expressly asserts that Christ is a mere creature, and ought not to be considered as the Supreme Being, is not false, if he be indeed a mere creature. The inference, then, is plain and unavoidable, though shocking and horrid; it is the language of the Bible, the language of Jesus Christ, that is void of truth."

V. If Unitarianism be true, Mahomet was wiser than Jesus Christ; for "as wisdom consists in choosing the best means for obtaining a proposed end, we need only examine what was the *end* of each, in establishing his religion, and then enquire what *method* the one and the other took to succeed in their designs. Mahomet's design was, as he declares, to make known the true God, as exalted far above all creatures—to make him known, as the only object of religious worship; who ought to be distinguished from all other beings, even from Christ himself: maintaining, that Jesus is far from partaking with his Father in the glories of the Deity. Of these things Mahomet endeavors to persuade mankind; and for this purpose he makes use of plain, and strong, and proper expressions. He loudly and vehemently declares, that they who treat Jesus Christ as God, are idolaters; which is the direct way to accomplish his design. It is supposed also, that the great end of Jesus Christ is to glorify God. To *glorify God*, is, according to the language of inspiration, to exalt him far above all other beings. The ancient prophets, foretelling that God should be glorified, in an extraordinary manner, in the latter times, express their ideas in the following words: 'The lofty looks of men shall be humbled, and the haughtiness of man shall be bowed down, and the LORD ALONE SHALL BE EXALTED in that day.' But Christ debases God, at the very time he professes to exalt him; for, by his expressions, he puts himself in the place of God. This he does, when he calls himself God; when he claims divine perfections; when he attributes to himself the work of creation; and when he applies to himself those oracles of the prophets which display the essential characters of the Supreme Being.

"If it be said, 'It is sufficient that Christ declares, *his Father is greater than he:*' I answer, it would be a haughty kind of modesty for a mere creature to say, 'the Former of all things is greater than I.' Neither

Moses nor Isaiah, nor any of the prophets, ever used such languuage. A loyal subject never affects to say, the King is greater than I. That is taken for granted. Nor will a holy creature make use of such language concerning his Creator; because it would be, in some sense, to compare himself with the infinite God. Besides, what would it avail for Jesus, *once* in the course of his converse on earth, to say, 'My Father is greater than I;' when in the general tenor of his conduct and language, and in the language he taught his disciples, he speaks and acts as if he were the true God?"

VI. If Unitarianism is true, Mahomet was more *concerned for the good of mankind* than Jesus Christ. This appears from the fact that "a prudent and diligent endeavor to preserve men from idolatry is one of the greatest marks of a sincere regard to their happiness; because idolatry destroys their souls, by excluding them from the kingdom of heaven. If, then, Jesus Christ be not a divine person, of the same essence with his Father, he has not taken proper measures to preserve men from the dreadful evil of idolatry, while Mahomet has done it effectually; for he has abolished the Christian idolatry in a great part of the world, and laid such foundations of his own religion, that a man cannot be guilty of idolatry, without first ceasing to be his disciple. But as for Christ, he has given occasion to it; he has laid a foundation for it. For he does not only permit and direct his disciples to give him the titles of the Supreme Being, but also to ascribe to him the perfections and works of Deity, and to apply to him many of the sublimest oracles of the Old Testament, which relate to the God of Israel.

"It was, for instance, a very surprising thing that Jesus, when he appeared to Thomas, after his resurrection, should suffer him to cry out, 'My Lord, and my God!' without saying a word to him about the impiety and blasphemy of an exclamation, which treats the creature as if he were the Creator. Thomas, before,

was an unbeliver, now he is an idolator. Till that instant, he would not believe that Jesus was risen; he considered him as a man lying under the power of death; but now, on a sudden, he addresses him as God, he bows and adores. Of the two extremes, the latter is most condemnable; for unbelief is not so criminal as idolatry. That dishonoring Jesus Christ; this usurping the throne of God. Better for Thomas, therefore, to have persisted in this unbelief, than, by renouncing it, to fall into idolatry. And yet, strange indeed! strange to astonishment! who can account for it? Jesus upbraids him only with the former; not at all with the latter. Besides, as our Lord could not but know what an impression these words of his amazed and adoring Apostle would make on the minds of men; as he knew that the Jews, deceived by expressions less exceptionable than these, had accused him of blasphemy; and as he knew that these very expressions would give occasion to Christians in succeeding ages, to treat him as the true God; it is evident that he ought, from a concern for the good of mankind, to have strictly prohibited all expressions which tended to make such a dangerous impression. And yet he not only permits his disciples to speak after this manner; but directs them to record the expressions, for the perusal of all future generations; and that without giving the least hint that the terms are used in a new and uncommon sense, though they appear so impious and blasphemous.

VII. If Unitarianism is true, Mahomet was *more zealous for the glory of God* than Jesus Christ. "The essential glory of God consists in the eminence of his perfections, by which he is infinitely exalted above all other beings; and his manifestative glory, or the honor he receives from his rational creatures in the acts of religion, by which he is distinguished from every creature. Now Mahomet has glorified God, by distinguishing him from all other beings; but it does not appear that he has been thus honored by Jesus Christ; since his own

expressions and conduct, and the language of his Apostles, have a natural tendency to make us consider a mere creature as the Great Supreme. All expressions which attribute to a creature the characters of God's glory are sacrilegious. Nay, though they might receive a sense which is not impious; yet they are unlawful, if their ambiguity be such as renders them liable to be misinterpreted, to the dishonor of God, by an impartial searcher after truth. For if, in civil commerce, equivocal language, which, without any force upon the expressions, may be so understood as to injure a lawful sovereign, would be accounted criminal; and if, when the dignity of majesty is deeply interested, we consider the silence of some and the equivocations of others, who ought to speak clearly for their master's honor, as so many implicit acts of treason; have we not reason to condemn equivocations in the case before us, of impiety and blasphemy, though there were nothing else to induce us to do it? But a man must be wilfully blind who does not see that there is something more than mere ambiguity in a language which is little short of a perpetual application of the characteristics of God's glory to Jesus Christ.

"Hence, I conclude, if Christ be a mere creature, that Mahomet has spoken conformably to truth and prudence; to a concern for the good of mankind, and a zeal for th eglory of God. While Jesus—detested be the thought!—while Jesus has spoken imprudently and falsely; while he has spoken cruelly, in regard to us; and impiously, in respect to God."

VIII. Unitarianism not only consecrates the Mahomedan religion, but charges the Saviour with blasphemy against the God of heaven; for it certainly must be blasphemy for any creature to claim to be equal with God—to claim the divine attributes, or suffer himself to be addressed by the names peculiar to God. But all this is done by Jesus Christ, as we have proved in a former chapter. Therefore, if Unitarianism be true,

which makes Christ nothing but a creature, he must be a blasphemer. Again, Jesus Christ claimed and received religious worship, which in a still clearer manner fixes upon him the charge of blasphemy, if he is not God.

"A man, for instance, who should take the name of king, where a rightful sovereign is acknowledged, would certainly be very guilty. But his crime would be greatly enhanced, if he dared to assume the titles appropriated to signify the grandeur of his sovereign, and the extent of his dominions. But he would be still more guilty, if he caused himself to be treated as a king; if he demanded the titles of majesty from those who addressed him; and required, as some kings do, to be served on the knee. In this case, either the allegiance due to the lawful sovereign must be renounced; or this pretender must be called an usurper, and be punished as guilty of high treason." But our Saviour, in addition to assuming the titles of Deity, suffers himself to be worshipped by his adoring followers; therefore, if he is not truly and properly God, he must be guilty of blasphemy.—*Abbadie.*

IX. Unitarianism justifies the Jews in the most execrable parricide that was ever committed, that is, the murder of Jesus Christ.

"In the law which God gave to the Jews, as may be seen in the thirteenth chapter of Deuteronomy, it is said, 'If there arise among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder, and the sign or the wonder come to pass whereof he spake unto thee, saying, let us go after other Gods, which thou hast not known, and let us serve them, thou shalt not harken unto the voice of that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams; for the Lord your God proveth you, to know whether ye will love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul. Ye shall walk after the Lord your God, and fear him, and keep his commandments, and obey his voice, and ye shall serve him

and cleave unto him. And that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams shall be put to death.'

"Both Jews and Christians understood Christ to claim the worship of men. The former accused him of making himself equal with God, and the latter acknowledged him to be so, and he said nothing to oppose, but every thing to confirm these impressions. While at one time he would command them to *love God* with all their heart, at another he would interrogate them thus: '*Lovest* thou ME.' He said emphatically, 'Thou shalt *love* the LORD thy GOD and him *only* shalt thou *serve:*' and then again, 'If any man *serve* ME, him shall my Father honor.' Though the law said, 'Ye shall walk after the Lord your God, and fear him, and keep his commandments, and obey his voice, and serve him, and cleave unto him;' and that whosoever would turn men from so doing should be put to death; yet he taught the people to love him, to hear his voice, to follow him, to obey his commandments, and to do every thing to him that this law prohibited from being done to any being but God. If he be not God, then, he did, in an eminent degree, teach the people to go after another God; and serve him, and the Jews could not avoid putting him to death in conformity to their law."—*Luckey.*

X. Unitarianism destroys our hopes of heaven; for,

1. If Christ is not God, he must be a creature; and if a creature, he was created by God, and consequently owes all his powers to God; and should he serve him from the time he was created, down through the ages of eternity, he would do no more than his bounden duty; therefore he could have no merit to apply to the case of any other, consequently could not make an atonement.

2. It limits the Saviour in all his attributes, and divests him of all his power to save. For if he is not infinite in wisdom he cannot know all our wants, therefore he cannot supply them. Neither can he know, while dispensing our future destinies, what will be best

for us; and that soul cheering promise, that "all things shall work together for good to them that love God," which has born us up under so many trials, and caused our hearts to rejoice in the midst of so many afflictions, may forever fail. If he is not omnipresent he cannot always be with us to encourage, strengthen, and support us; and although he is touched with the feelings of our infirmities, and having been tempted in all points like as we are, he knows how to succour them that are tempted, yet, peradventure, while he leaves us to visit his followers in some distant clime, Satan may take the advantage of our weakness, overcome and destroy us forever. If Christ is not Almighty, then surely we have a slender arm on which to depend for salvation. Our subtle and powerful enemy, the Prince of the power of the air, who goeth about like a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour, may overpower the Saviour, defeat him in all his plans, and finally drag us down to the chambers of eternal death, in spite of all that has been done to save us. Again, if Christ is not the infinite and immutable God, then he must be finite, and subject to change; and if so, then he may change the entire plan of salvation, and give us no knowledge of its terms, or he may change in his determination to save us at all, and finally leave us destitute of a Saviour altogether.

3. Unitarianism destroys our hopes of heaven by denying the personality and divinity of the Holy Ghost, and reducing him to a mere effusion or an agent, without either personality or intelligence, which is, in fact, denying that there is any Holy Ghost. Consequently, if Unitarianism be true, we have no heavenly messenger "to reprove us of sin, of righteousness, and of a judgment to come,"—no Holy Ghost to inspire us with a burning zeal for the glory of God and the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom—to comfort our hearts, enlighten our understandings, change our natures, purify our souls, and render us meet for an inher-

itance among those that are sanctified. That promise of peace and joy in the Holy Ghost can never be verified; the baptism of the Spirit is a mere deception; and finally, if Unitarianism is true, the Bible is false and religion a dream.

4. Unitarianism destroys all our hopes of heaven by denying the vicarious death and sufferings of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. It first strips the Saviour of his Godhead, and consequently renders his suffering destitute of merit, and then it boldly contradicts the word of God and affirms that Christ did not die to redeem us from the curse of a broken law. It, therefore, takes away the mercy seat, annihilates the blood besprinkled throne of grace before which the guilty, trembling, helpless sinner might approach and plead the merits of a crucified redeemer, and leaves us without a mediator, exposed to the wrath of a sin avenging God; that God who is "angry with the wicked every day," and who "is of purer eyes than to behold sin with the least degree of allowance, but with the greatest abhorence and detestation." It levels the whole gospel fabric with the ground, and removes the very corner stone of the Christians hope, which is placed in the meritorious death and suffering of Jesus Christ, and shuts him out from the last lingering ray of gospel light and dooms him forever to grope in that eternal night

"Which has no morn beyond it, and no star"

exposed to the keen ire of the Almighty's wrath, which is so fearfully pronounced against all those who violate his righteous laws. Unitarianism, therefore, by denying faith in the blood of Jesus Christ renders it impossible for any to be saved, for "there is no other name given under heaven, or among men, whereby we can be saved," consequently, if Unitarianism is true, universal damnation must inevitably follow.

5. Unitarianism destroys our hopes of heaven by denying the authenticity of the sacred scriptures. It

contradicts the Bible, makes the Bible contradict itself, and finally, as if grown bold through trifling with sacred things, it fearlessly denies the inspiration of that holy book. If, then, the Bible is contradictory and false, where is our hope? We have no knowledge of God, his attributes, or his will: we know nothing of Jesus Christ, his nature, or his office: we know not whether there has been any plan devised for our redemption and salvation, or if there has, we are ignorant of its terms or the means by which we are to obtain its benefits. We are left like a mariner upon the trackless ocean without a chart or compass—no sun, nor even the faint glimmering of a star to guide us to the desired haven. And, indeed, we know not whether there is a heaven to gain or a hell to shun; and if there is, we may founder in the one without knowing how to obtain the other. All is a dark and fearful uncertainty. We see by daily observation that we are mortal, and tending to the tomb, and that very soon we must all die, but whether we shall live again or not we cannot tell. Our souls may perish with our bodies, or they may live through all eternity in bliss or woe: this too is all uncertain. The promise of a resurrection, and of immortality and eternal life beyond the grave, is taken from us; for if Unitarianism is true, the Bible must be false, and these consoling promises must forever fail, while we are doomed to perpetual skepticism and doubt. Thus we see Unitarianism saps the very foundation of christianity, takes away all moral restraint, and opens the flood gates of infidelity, that moral scourge which has spread death and destruction over the face of the whole earth. It was a disbelief in the word and threatenings of God which induced Eve to partake of the forbidden fruit; and it is that same unbelieving infidel principle that has ever been the fostering mother of all iniquity. Who, then, will dare to risk their eternal all on such a system as this? Who that has ever read their Bible and been struck with awe and admiration while they have

contemplated the sublimity of its style, the pureness of its morals, and the exalted nature of its doctrines? Who that ever heard the thunderings of Sinai, and with trembling confessed that by the deeds of the law could no flesh be justified, and then in that book of books divine has read the story of the cross, the condescension of the Saviour, who was God over all, and yet for our sake became incarnate, became obedient unto death even the death of the cross, and who gave himself a ransom for us to redeem us from the curse of a violated law, who arose for our justification, and ascended up on high, and there sitteth at the right hand of God to make intercession for us? Who, I say, in view of all this, can embrace a system which denies the Bible by denying all its fundamental doctrines? Can we renounce the Bible, that richest of heaven's blessings, in which alone life and immortality are brought to light, and upon the truth of which hangs our eternal destinies? We who live in the full blaze of gospel day, and in whose hearts the glorious sun of righteousness has shone with healing in its beams, and by its effulgent rays has scattered the gloomy clouds of moral darkness and despair and given us peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ—can we renounce the Bible? No—heaven forbid. Sooner, far sooner, let our right hand forget its cunning and our tongue cleave to the roof of our mouth; yea, let our bodies be lashed to the burning stake and perish in the flames, than that we should give up that holy Book, or deny one of its momentous truths.

ERRATA.

PAGE.	LINE.	
5	29	For Socinins, read Socinus.
6	25	For Parke, read Parker.
125	1	For John Power, read John H. Power.
152	18	For each of three persons, read each of *these* three persons.
147	21	In a few copies, for defy, read *deify*.

INDEX.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE.

ON THE IMPROPRIETY OF MAKING HUMAN REASON THE TEST OF THE DOCTRINES OF DIVINE REVELATION, 5

Shown, I. From the fact that human reason has been corrupted by sin, 9
II. From the reflection which an appeal to reason instead of revelation would cast upon Deity, 10
III. If reason were to be our guide, revelation would not be necessary, 10
IV. Faith would not be the gift of God, 11
V. From the opinions of ancient Philosophers, 12
VI. From Scripture testimony, 13

CHAPTER II.

IMPORTANCE OF THE TRINITY, 22

Shown, I. From a knowledge of God being fundamental to religion, 23
II. From its being necessary to explain the Scriptures, 23
III. From our views of God, 24
IV. From a denial of it changing our love to God, 25
V. The doctrine of Atonement depends upon the doctrine of the Trinity, 27
VI. A denial of the doctrine of the Trinity changes the Christian experience, 28
VII. Changes our love to Christ, 29
VIII. Destroys all hope and trust in Christ as a Saviour, 29
IX. From the manner in which a denial of it would affect the credit of the Scriptures, 31

CHAPTER III.

PERSONALITY AND DIVINITY OF THE HOLY GHOST, 34

Personality.

Proved, I. From the mode of his subsistence in the Trinity, 34

PAGE.
II. From the Scriptures being unintelligible if the Spirit be not a person, 34
III. From personification of any attribute of Deity being impossible in many passages where the Spirit is spoken of, 35
IV. From the masculine pronouns applied to him, 36
V. Objections answered, 37

Divinity.

Proved, I. From the act of creating, 40
II. From being associated with the Father and the Son in the inspiration of the Prophets, 41
III. From being the Lord of Hosts, 42
IV. From the Tabernacle and Apostolic form of benediction, 42
V. From the form of baptism, 43
VI. From being the Most High, 44
VII. From being the Spirit of God, 47
VIII. From being God, 48

CHAPTER IV.

DIVINITY OF CHRIST, 54

Proved, I. From his pre-existence, 55
II. From being the Jehovah of the Old Testament, 59
III. From his titles, 69
IV. From his acts, 83
V. From his eternity, 89
VI. From his immutability, 100
VII. From his omnipresence, 104
VIII. From his omniscience, 111
IX. From his omnipotence, 120
X. From his being an object of worship, 134

CHAPTER V.

DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY, 154

Proved, I. From the opinion of the Fathers, 155
II. From its antiquity and universal spread, 163
III. From the word Elohim, 164
IV. From other plural expressions, 166
V. From the form of benediction used by the Jewish High Priests, 168
VI. From the form of baptism, 171
VII. From the doxology used by the Apostles, 174
VIII. From the benediction used by the Apostles, 174
IX. Objections answered, 181

PAGE.

CHAPTER VI.

ORIGINAL STATE OF MAN, 189

Proved, I. From man being the effect of a holy cause, 189
II. From his being created in the image of God, 190
III. From the seal of the Divine approbation, 191
IV. From his being created upright, 192

CHAPTER VII.

FALL OF MAN, 193

Proved, I. From the Mosaic history, 193
II. From Scriptural reference to the Mosaic history. 195
Depravity of all men in consequence of the Fall,
Proved, I. From the fall of the first man, 198
II. From the fact that men have been generally wicked, 199
III. From the salvation of infants by the death of Christ, 211
IV. From the death and suffering of children, 211
V. From Scripture testimony, 212
VI. Objections answered, 222

CHAPTER VIII.

ATONEMENT, 225

Proved, I. From those Scriptures which speak of Christ suffering and dying for us, 226
II. From the death of Christ being penal, 233
III. From the death of Christ being propitiatory, 234
IV. From those Scriptures which speak of reconciliation as being effected by the death of Christ, 237
V. From Christ being a redeemer, 244
VI. Objections answered, 248

CHAPTER IX.

OBJECTIONS TO UNITARIANISM, 260

I. It contradicts the Bible, 260
II. It makes the Bible contradict itself, 261
III. Makes Mahomedanism a reformation of Christianity, 270
IV. Makes Mahomet more true than Jesus Christ, 273
V. Makes Mahomet wiser than Jesus Christ, 274
VI. Makes Mahomet more concerned for the good of mankind than Jesus Christ, 275
VII. Makes Mahomet mor zealous for the glory of God than Jesus Christ, 276
VIII. Makes Jesus Christ a blasphemer, 277
IX. Justifies the Jews in murdering the Saviour, 278
X. Destroys the Christian's hope of heaven, 279

SITY OF CHICAGO
7 552 572

1- 4507

473617

No Records